The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 1920 NUMBER 282

Contents

The Week 257
Leading Editorials
- Palmer Vice-Regent 260
- The Problem of Germany 261
- American By Decree 262
- How the Profits Tax Affects Industry 263
- On Behalf of Louis F. Post 264
- Moses Against Moscow 266

General Articles
- The Line-Up in Iowa ..... Charles Merz 267
- Why Shoes Are Dear ..... Judson C. Welliver 269
- The Walkout on the Railroads ..... S. Zimand 272
- Britain's Capital Levy ..... Sidney Webb 275
- They Must Have Espionage ..... William Hard 277
- The Rebel Switchmen ..... C. M. 280
- An All-British Sonnet (Verse) ..... Siegfried Sassoon 282
- A Dynamic Personality (Verse) ..... Clara Shanafelt 282

Correspondence 283
Books and Things ..... P. L. 288
Literary Notes ..... Piccolo 289
Reviews of Books
- The Romantic Woman ..... F. H. 290
- Fallen Kings ..... Rebecca West 291
- American Literature ..... Percy H. Boynton 292
- Stephen Graham ..... W. H. C. 293

The Week

THE San Remo conference of the Allied Premiers may well go down to history as the most important international event since Versailles. The fate of Turkey is to be decided, and with it the fate of Armenia, Palestine, Constantinople. Important conclusions will be reached in the matter of dealing with Russia and Germany. Preliminary agreements on international finance and commerce may be made. The United States, after its thirty billion ante in the game of internationalism, has no place at the table. It is not even looking on. Dispositions will be made affecting American interests, but if America is even informed what they are it will be by courtesy of the governments represented. That is not the fault of the Allied governments, but of our own. An American representative would have been cordially welcomed, although his voice would not have carried great weight, in view of our inaction on the Treaty of Versailles. Nevertheless, his opinion would not have been altogether neglected. There remains a chance that America may join the League of Nations, if the development of that institution does not drift too far away from the possibility of American support.

SECRECY, tempered by well calculated leaks, ruined the Conference of Versailles. Still more baffling secrecy enshrouds the diplomats at San Remo. Expensive correspondents are cabling poetic descriptions of the vistas of hills and waters in view of the statesmen as they sit round the table. "They are holding their sessions amid cacti and carnations, palm trees and pink roses in the Villa Devachan (the 'Second Paradise' of the Theosophists)". That sounds authentic, but not very illuminating. For the rest the correspondents are drawing on their imagination. Millerand intends to accomplish this or that (usually the clue to his intentions is Foch's opinions). Lloyd George has opposing intentions; he has more adroitness, but Millerand has the characteristic British doggedness. If that sort of thing is the best that the peoples are going to get when the League is in full operation, it is a safe prediction that America will stay out. We have nobody we would trust to make vital decisions for us amid the secrecies of cacti and carnations, palm trees and pink roses.

ITALIAN diplomacy appears to be feeling its way toward normal relations with Soviet Russia. An agreement has been reached for the exchange of military and civil prisoners, the Italians to bring some 5,000 Russian prisoners to Odessa and take away the four hundred Italian prisoners in the hands of the Soviet government. Italy is to provide the home-coming Russians with boots, fresh linen and other clothing, on the basis of credits opened for the purpose by the Soviet government. The steamers bringing the prisoners to Odessa will carry cargoes of grain on their return voyage "in view of the further Italo-Russian commercial accord authorized by Lenin." We quote from a Milan dispatch to the Times. We should like to know more about that commercial accord. We should also like to know more about the blockade status in the Baltic. Sweden has agreed to enter

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon trading relations with Soviet Russia as soon as the Franco-British blockade is lifted. It is a puzzle to us what would happen to a Swedish ship, or an American ship, attempting to put in at a Russian port, now when Italian ships can do so in the south without molestation.

ACCORDING to Count Czernin, Italian diplomacy dominated the affairs of the Entente during the war. That is something persons outside of the diplomatic game never suspected, but if one puts together such bits of evidence as cropped up and passed unnoticed, Czernin's statement looks plausible. If Italy is in fact endowed with diplomatic competence beyond other nations, the San Remo conference may achieve something of lasting benefit, after all. For in the main, Italy is on the right side, now. She wishes to bring about a German settlement that might offer a chance of economic rehabilitation in Central Europe. She wishes to put an end to the Russian blockade, and is said to be ready to accord the Soviet Republic whatever recognition may be necessary to this end. Further, she wishes to concentrate attention upon the problems of international finance and the exchange rate. The Italian government has been doing its best to restore order in its own finances through the levy of drastic taxes. But it recognizes that Italy can not reconstruct herself economically so long as the energies of the Allies are drawn away from the financial problem to the liquidation of war issues that should already have been wound up.

FROM a human point of view the most important issue that may be decided at San Remo is the fate of Armenia. Soviet Russia can live without trading relations. Germany can get along for some time as she has in late months. The depression of the exchanges can be endured. But unless some satisfactory Armenian settlement is arrived at, and soon, there will be no Armenian people left. Massacres, disease, despair and starvation are working remorselessly among this unhappy people, whose most terrible sufferings were occasioned by their refusal to fight with the Turks against the Entente Powers who are now to decide their fate. There was hope, once, that America might accept a mandate for Armenia, but with the prostitution of the mandate idea to imperialistic purposes this hope has vanished. The next best hope was for a mandate in the League of Nations. But the League does not possess, and will not undertake to find, resources for carrying this responsibility. England and France are well loaded up with profitable mandates and if either evinced a willingness to undertake the protection of Armenia, the motives, however good, might be misconstrued. A mandate to a lesser state, with common sharing of the costs, seems to be the best solution left.

LUETTWITZ and Bischoff, late aspirants for the honor of restoring the old order in Germany, have been arrested at Stettin. That may be a rather embarrassing haul for the German government. If it is too lenient with the conspirators of reaction, the Left will make good use of the fact, as evidence of the essentially reactionary character of the government. If the conspirators are too severely punished, the Right will be further embittered. Whatever policy the government pursues in the matter it is bound to take a rather heavy loss. If it were strong that might not greatly matter. But it is weak. Its action may, therefore, be expected to be vitiated by compromise.

WEAKNESS, in the ordinary case, is the most damaging charge that can be brought against a government. The case of Germany is extraordinary. No strong government could possibly adjust itself to all the conflicting conditions imposed upon Germany by the conquerors. The Berlin representatives of the Entente, it is reported, have warned Germany that she must execute without delay the disarmament and demobilization clauses of the Peace Treaty. They have also warned her that she must immediately put down all insurrections. If she fails to carry out either obligation the Allies may refuse further deliveries of food stuffs. It is an interesting speculation what a professionally strong government like General Wood could do in the circumstances. Disband the army and put down insurrection, both at once. Or starve.

JAPAN is indeed a menace, if there is any reality in the doctrine, assiduously cultivated by romanticists during the Russo-Japanese war, of the unswerving and unquestioning devotion of the whole Japanese people to the Imperial dynasty and the clique of great aristocrats surrounding the Emperor. It makes no difference whether a ruling clique is oriental or occidental, Japanese or Prussian; it is inevitably subject to delusions of greatness and inclined to aggression. But are the Japanese people such sentimental devotees as the current doctrine implies? Just now the government is appealing to the electorate on the question of universal suffrage, urged by the opposition. The fate of the nation turns on the issues, declares Premier Hara—whom the western world mistook for a liberal. "Universal suffrage, advocated by the opposition,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aims at the destruction of social class distinctions, and even proposes to tamper with the conscription system, which is the very basis of the country's defense, if speeches in the House serve as an index." That is to admit that the Japanese government does not in fact rule by the consent of the Japanese people. There are, it appears, really liberal forces powerful enough to disturb the government whether or not they can force its reorganization. That, we submit, is the most encouraging news that has come out of Japan in many years. A ruling caste that fears the people does not own the people, body and soul, by feudal rights.

NEW YORK STATE can claim whatever credit there may be in a legislature as valiant to execute the word of command as the Prussian Death's Head Hussars. The commanders may be mad, but that is irrelevant to strict discipline. After flouting the American tradition of representative institutions by expelling the Socialists, thereby winning for the State an odium from which it will not soon recover, the legislature has proceeded ruthlessly to pass the Lusk educational bills, of which the committee on the amendment of the law of the New York City Bar Association says:

> These bills may be aptly described as bills to Prussianize the educational system and the intellectual activities of the State of New York, although it may be doubted whether the late Imperial German Government, destroyed by the overdevelopment of its regulatory powers, even in its heyday ever perpetrated such a frank and undisguised attempt at casting into a rigid mold the thought and intellectual development of its subjects.

The governor will, of course, veto the bills. But it is a remarkable thing that the politics of a great state should have come to such a pass that nothing but the good sense and honest Americanism of one man stands between the people and the application of such mediaeval tyranny.

ACCORDING to the first of these bills, no schools or courses of instruction on any subject whatever shall be conducted without license granted by the Regents. No license shall be granted unless the Regents are satisfied that the instruction proposed will not be "detrimental to the public interests." Schools or courses of instruction thus licensed are subject to visitation and after notice and hearing their licenses may be revoked. But public schools, union free and common school districts, educational institutions incorporated by the University of the State and schools conducted by "well recognized" religious denominations, are exempted. The second bill provides that every teacher in the public schools or union free or common school districts shall obtain from the commissioner of education a certificate of good moral character giving satisfactory proof that the holder will support the state and federal constitutions, and is loyal to the institutions and laws of state and nation. The certificate may be revoked on the ground that the holder is not of good moral character or for any act or utterance showing he will not support the constitution or is not loyal to the institutions and laws.

PRIVATE property is one of the institutions of the state and nation. Private ownership of railways is another. Prohibition is now an institution standing in the room of the recent institution of the saloon. The irresponsible legislative budget, the general property tax, the excess profits tax, capital punishment are among other laws and institutions that a public school teacher must be loyal to, according to the letter of the bills. He must be loyal not merely in the presence of his classes, but whenever a spy might be present. Of course, the law could not be administered in this literal sense. There are no such moral worms as would consent to teach in the New York schools if they had to subscribe to a blanket loyalty to whatever is. The Regents might be expected to use discretion in deciding what is and what is not commendable disloyalty. But that is exactly the most outrageous feature of the bills. They do not aim at general regulation, but at a lawful means by which witch burners like Senator Lusk and Archibald Stevenson may destroy such schools and such teachers as they please. Look at the derisive appropriations for the administration of the proposed laws: Fifteen thousand dollars for the first, ten thousand for the second. Nothing but occasional arbitrary persecution could be conducted at such trifling expense.

GENERAL WOOD certainly can not like to see United States bonds, yielding four and a quarter per cent, selling under eighty-seven. Yet he keeps talking about spreading the war debt over a greater number of years than is now contemplated. That would be to delay still longer the return of the "best securities in the world" to par. General Wood stands for the rights of property, first of all. Well, have those American citizens who paid par for these government bonds no right to a financial policy that will give them back the money they paid in? General Wood stands for the increase of our national power. Does he not overlook the fact that the ability to raise vast loans at a low rate is an important factor in national power? America has lost that ability, temporarily,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and will not regain it until the volume of debt has been greatly reduced. Somehow General Wood's financial opinions seem not to go well with his complexion and stature. They look second hand and precipitately selected at that.

OF all the current Presidential booms Johnson's is just now making the most notable progress. In the Chicago Republican primaries two voters out of every eleven took the trouble to write his name on the ballot. It is alleged that there was some machine work in this result, and that is quite possible. But among the forty thousand who voted for Johnson there must have been a large element of the kind of personal support that upsets the calculations of the experts. The Chicago delegates will vote for Wood on the first ballot, but they will at least entertain the idea of swinging to Johnson later, especially if he gains decisive support in Indiana. The odds remain heavily against Johnson and what he stands for, but it is no longer possible to affirm that his chances for the nomination are nil.

Palmer Vice-Regent

THERE was a time when Mr. Burleson's lead was so big that it seemed impossible any one would overtake him. That was before Mr. Palmer became the Vice-Regent. Now Mr. Burleson is overtaken, passed and lost to sight. None can hope to compete with Mr. Palmer. For sheer incompetence, for mischievous meddling, for braying and bragging, for ignorance of fact, ignorance of history, for lawlessness and disorderly conduct, there is none to touch Mr. Palmer. He is clearly the worst cabinet officer within memory.

Mr. Palmer's opportunity to secure this distinction arose out of the President's absence from Washington and his long illness and the self-effacing qualities of the other Secretaries. There was a vacuum of government and Mr. Palmer filled it with himself and his Department of Justice. The country demanded relief from mounting prices. One would have supposed that the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, the Interior, Labor, and the Treasury would have been the normal agencies to deal with the price and the supply of bread, shoes, clothes. The supposition is mistaken. Under the theory now prevailing at Washington, the proper persons to deal with world-wide economic dislocation are a bright sleuth, a secret service agent, a plain-clothes man, flying squadrons, and the proper method threats, raids and oaths to heaven.

The country is afflicted with a great coal strike arising out of the disorganization of an industry and the friction of high prices against low wages. One would have supposed that the departments of government normally interested in such questions, or that a specially expert commission, were best qualified to intervene. Not at all. The way they dig coal in Washington is first by violating their own promises, and then by securing an injunction, and then by raids and deportations. The country is in a panicky state about revolutionary infection from Russia. One would have supposed that the way to deal with that was quietly and coolly and on sufficient evidence to arrest, to try, to convict if the evidence warranted those engaged in criminal conspiracies, and for the rest to allay fears by exhibiting the government as an agency devoted to constructive reform. Not at all. The way to deal with excitement is to become more excited, the way to allay revolutionary feeling is to talk about revolution every day, to accustom every one to the idea of revolution, and to call men revolutionists who are not revolutionists. Government according to Palmer consists in becoming as frantic as ever you can, in mistaking your own tingling nerves for results accomplished, and trying to drown the memory of one failure after another by announcing the inception of the next.

Up to date the results of Mr. Palmer's pursuit of fame are these: Prices have gone up though he ordered them to go down. Industrial unrest is greater than it was before he started to increase it because he has convinced nearly a half million miners, their wives, their families, their friends, and their fellow workers that the promise given when the Lever act was enacted was false, and that the technicalities of war work for the operators and against the miners. By saying that the recent railway strike was bolshevik, I. W. W., and inspired by Lenin he has convinced thousands of excellent Americans that a Cabinet officer can slander his fellow-citizens without rebuke. It is indeed a splendid beginning towards the creation of good feeling in industry.

And yet there is something to be said for Mr. Palmer. You can say for him that he is an unmitigated exponent of a political theory widely held by Americans. It is the theory of government as an elaborated policeman. The American people have a touching faith in the police power. They have tried at one time or another to solve the trust problem, the labor problem, sin, heresy, monopoly, to assimilate aliens, to censor plays and movies, to standardize clothing, to win assent for the war and to raise voluntary loans by the police. It is no wonder that a silly and ambitious man should suppose

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he could dig coal and run railroads by the same method.

Mr. Palmer has been acting on the theory of government which is deeply ingrained in America as a result of a long tradition. In that tradition, born of the revolutionary experience of the eighteenth century, government is reduced to its lowest terms as the sovereign source of law and order. Its function is limited to the repression of abnormal occurrences. But as the Great Society grew in complexity, abnormal occurrences became so frequent as to become part of the normal life of modern society. The traditional theory remained, and the only method that theory knows was employed to deal with the occurrences. Conservatives and reformers alike continued to regard the police power as the regular way to deal with questions that had long ceased to be occasional and had become institutional. Of course they failed. When for instance a monopoly was a freak, it was possible for the prosecuting attorney to deal with it. When combination became a standard method of great industry, the prosecuting attorney was helpless. For size, frequency, and complexity are differences of kind, not merely of degree. A problem that has become vast, continual and intricate is a totally different problem from one which resembles it, but is small, rare, and simple. It is no longer amenable to the eighteenth century treatment of laissez-faire punctuated by the police power, or in Wilsonian phrase, to the New Freedom punctuated by raids.

The kind of modern problem with which Mr. Palmer has been fumbling requires a radically different philosophy. It requires an understanding that society has generated conflicts of interest at once too powerful and too elusive to be clubbed into harmony. You can enjoin and defeat the union leaders; the men will strike under new leaders; you can arrest the new leaders, one strike may crumble, but the disaffection poisons the roots of productive effort. The substitute for the club is the building of institutions in which the areas of conflict are reduced and the remaining conflicts focussed to the scrutiny of a steady and informed public opinion. A public opinion with its attention fixed on the real conflicts would inevitably begin to remodel its prejudices, to discriminate moral values, in short to reeducate itself for modern life by seeking welfare rather than by conforming to rule. The will to understand must precede every other change; an intellectual renascence precedes every permanent historic advance. As instruments of that will institutions are created which enlightened men look upon not as sacred cows, but as expedients primarily, and ultimately as experience and experiments in the adventure of mankind.

The Problem of Germany

THE Anglo-French disagreement over the handling of the Ruhr situation is now a closed incident. The Germans are to get their troops out of the neutral zone at the earliest possible moment. Thereupon the French occupation is to end. There are renewed pronouncements of Anglo-French solidarity, from both sides of the Channel. England is to support France vigorously in enforcing the Treaty and France is to consult fully with England on all measures she considers needful to this end. Whether actual solidarity has been attained depends, however, on just this: Has France agreed not only to consult England, but to regard England's assent as a necessary preliminary to action? The actual agreement between the two Powers is kept secret, after the fashion of up-to-date diplomacy. The plain inference from Millerand's statements, however, is that France retains an emergency freedom of action. This inference is still plainer in the argument of Raymond Poincaré in the Matin. Because the Franco-Anglo-American treaty is dead, or at least still hanging in the air, France has no assurance of immediate aid in case of a resurgence of German militarism. Therefore the law of self-preservation justified France in her recent policy of occupying German cities. It would justify similar action in the future.

It is easy to understand the French view, and impossible not to sympathize with it. Germany presents a terrible problem for the future of France. The Germans remain the most numerous and formidable people in Central Europe in spite of the losses they suffered in the war. Ludendorff and the military caste he represents remain unreconciled and irreconcilable. They dream of a war of revenge; they confidently expect affairs to shape themselves in such a way that in a few years Germany will be able to take back every foot of ground she has lost, and something besides for good measure. Many of them, no doubt, have been actively engaged in concocting plots to carry forward the organization for the future. Nobody knows exactly where they will intervene, what parties or factions they will use for a cover. A Russian reaction might be counted on to organize itself around monarchist nuclei; a French or British reaction would be found working in the interest of property. But Prussian militarism is a different thing. It used the Kaiser as an instrument without ever cherishing illusions about the Kaiser. It used German big business as an instrument, while despising business. Why might not Prussian militarism make Bolshevism its vehicle? Organized personal power can live in widely varying media.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That the French should regard everything that goes on beyond the Rhine with suspicion is entirely natural. That they should be skeptical about British and American clairvoyance in interpreting German events is also natural. A certain freedom of action is therefore a perfectly just and reasonable French claim. There may arise contingencies in which a real peril will arise, clearly visible to French eyes, but to no other. Shall they wait until they convince everybody else, at the risk of irreparable disaster? The English could not ask this, neither could the Americans.

Where, then, lies the obstacle to perfect accord? Simply in the fact that the French regard the Treaty of Versailles, in all its provisions, as something as sacred as the defense of France against imminent danger from across the Rhine. Grant France freedom of action, and she is likely to use it in enforcing provisions of the Treaty that the other Allied Powers subscribed to in hot blood or for moral effect, but no longer mean to enforce. That difference in point of view is fundamental. So long as it persists France cannot be given a free hand without the danger that the other Powers will be dragged into a kind of quarrel they would not voluntarily take up.

Shall the other Allied Powers accept the French policy of enforcing the letter of the Treaty? They might, if the policy offered any hope of a permanent solution of the German problem. It does not offer such hope. Under the strict terms of the Treaty not the militarists alone, but the plain German citizen feels himself enslaved and robbed of hope. Not the militarist alone, but the German peasant and workingmen as well dream of the time when alien forces can be expelled from the Rhineland. It may be said that the Germans will have to endure what they can not cure if the Allied and Associated Powers stand together. But there is the vast disordered territory of central and eastern Europe, with Asia in the background, penetrable by Germans and German influence, which every intelligent diplomacy will have to take into its calculations for the future. The German people as a whole will either become reconciled to the peace, and associate itself with the West, or it will make itself one with the East. And reconciliation can not be affected, in a generation, under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles.

England and Italy can not accept the French policy of strict enforcement. The dangers involved are too great. France can not accept the British and Italian policy without qualification. There is no predicting the future evolution of such a policy. The one way of bringing the conflict of policies to an end is by the definitive revision of the Treaty. Reduce the indemnity to a definite sum which the Germans can pay off in a reasonable time if they will go to work. Abolish the reparations commission and remove every discrimination against German trade. Eliminate the Saar Valley provisions and prepare to restore the German Rhinelands as soon as enough of the indemnity has been paid to remove the likelihood of repudiation. Disarm Germany even more completely by abolishing the permanent army and replacing it by a limited militia. Let the Treaty be one that can be enforced, and then enforce it.

That would put an end to misunderstanding and friction among the Allies. It would do more. A Germany with an opportunity to live and work and pay would develop economic and political interests that could not afford to permit themselves to serve as mere instruments to a recrudescent militarism.

American by Decree

IT was recently proposed by an ardent club speaker, as part of his program of "constructive Americanism" that only native-born citizens should be allowed to draw out foreign language books from the public libraries. This simply added to the day's amusement. One had visions of Italians forging American birth-certificates in order to borrow the Divine Comedy. But, insignificant as this orator was, he showed which way the wind blew. On April 17th a law became effective in Oregon which prohibits any foreign language newspaper, periodical, pamphlet or circular from being published unless it carries a literal English translation "in the same type and as conspicuously displayed." This is not quite so amusing. It becomes even less so when one learns that Oregon has set an example which may soon be followed by the United States government. In January of this year, Senator King of Utah introduced a bill, which has already been twice read in the Senate, providing for the withdrawal of the second class mailing privilege of the foreign language press. These papers would then have to pay at least three cents per pound or more, according to the zone tariff. Now they pay one cent a pound. The passage of Senator King's bill would be as effective as the Oregon law in depriving recent immigrants of their chief means of learning the laws of this country. The Oregonians are patriotically indignant at any such criticism. *Their* law, they assure us, will help "Americanize" the alien, because he will see English printed side by side with his own language and therefore learn English—on the principle of those excellent bilingual Testaments which are recommended as the royal road to Greek. But a foreign language paper is no Bible Society in the matter of funds. To print

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an English translation of everything is an economic impossibility. Under those conditions it must quit.

Another Oregonian argument is that this law will restrain the dangerously radical Japanese and Finnish press. The dangerous Japanese press in Oregon consists of one newspaper with a circulation of 1,700 and the dangerous Finnish press also narrows down to one paper. Perhaps Oregon does not know that federal authority already is empowered to suppress any publication so inimical to the United States as these papers are painted. Both Oregon and Senator King should be enlightened on this point, and, perhaps, on one other. Is it possible that they have forgotten the service done by the foreign language press to the government during the war by aiding the loans and explaining the draft? They certainly cannot be aware of this, nor of the fact that at present fifty-eight departments of the federal government issue daily information to more than eight hundred foreign language papers through the Bureau of Foreign Language Information Service of the American Red Cross. These relevant facts should be given a hearing in Oregon, and Senator King should have it carefully explained to him that in a country with sixteen million people of foreign birth, many of whom cannot speak English, it is prudent for the government to have its laws interpreted to those aliens, and that, strangely enough, their own tongues must serve until they acquire new ones.

How The Profits Tax Affects Industry

IN advocating the retention of the excess profits tax the New Republic does not ignore the fact that this tax must exert a certain depressant influence on industry. It takes over a billion out of the pockets of the taxpayers. It takes this money to use for current expenditures. That means a billion dollars less for investments at home and abroad than we should have if our public business could be conducted so economically that neither this tax nor any substitute for it would be required. But the critics of the tax do not propose methods by which the budget of public expenditures may be reduced. They propose instead other methods of raising the billion dollars required. A billion is a billion. Is there good reason for supposing that one method of taking it will more seriously reduce our investment fund than another method?

There is a theoretical reason. Excess profits fall for the most part to the few. For that reason it is less probable that the income will be used for current consumption than that wages would be thus used, or even the income from fixed investments, such as government bonds, which are widely distributed among persons of modest means, driven by the high cost of living to consume most of their income. If the maximum rate of accumulation of capital were the sole end of national economic policy the excess profits tax would be undesirable. We should seek to levy taxes on those whose incomes are inadequate and spare those whose incomes are in excess. By this logic we should be driven to favor also lower rates on large incomes and higher rates on small ones. The larger incomes of whatever origin are our most prolific source of new capital; the large incomes originating in profits are especially prolific.

But the maximum of accumulation is not the chief object of an intelligent economic policy. Maximum production comes nearer to being the chief object, though not even that could assume priority over considerations of fairness and justice. More capital means greater production, if all other things are equal. More capital at the expense of the purchasing power of labor is an altogether different matter. No practical economist would dispute the assertion that without any substantial addition to our capital fund, production could be increased ten or twenty per cent, or even more, if labor could or would develop maximum efficiency. It is equally certain that with our capital undiminished, production could decline ten or twenty per cent through decrease in labor's interest and efficiency. Take the tax off profits and make up the deficit through taxes on consumption that will fall in large part on labor. Does our working class find it so easy to make ends meet that this shifting of burdens would be accepted cheerfully? Or should we be forced to go through the painful process of adjusting wages upward, through strikes, or of adjusting efficiency downward through spontaneous soldiering on the job? It is an easy matter to weaken the economic position of labor, but it is not so easy for the nation, or even for the employers, to profit by it.

It is generally believed that the depressant influence of the excess profits tax is only in part accounted for by the absorption of funds that might otherwise be available for new capital investments. There are many business ventures that may bring rich returns, but may also result in losses. Say that a corporation is prepared to open up a new oil field, and that according to the best calculation it can make there are two chances of making one hundred per cent profits to three chances of just coming out even. The attractive power of such a venture would then be roughly equivalent to that of an undertaking offering a practical certainty of 40 per cent, if taxes did not need to be considered.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Under the excess profits tax, however, the undertaking yielding an almost certain $40 on each hundred dollars' capital would have to give up only $7.40 per hundred, while the hazardous venture, if successful, would have to give up $34.40. The tax kills practically all the incentive, in the latter case. Any one who keeps in close touch with practical business affairs is likely to know personally of several instances of such ventures considered and abandoned on account of the excess profits tax. It is not surprising that the consensus of opinion among men who have observed this effect of the tax should be unfavorable to it.

And yet it is one thing to show that the excess profits tax discourages particular enterprises, and a totally different thing to show that it lames our national enterprise as a whole. The capital that is kept from plunging into Kansas oil development does not therefore evaporate nor does it even lie dormant. It seeks safer opportunities. And in doing so it is perhaps the more likely to benefit the nation as a whole.

There is hardly an industry supplying the vital requirements of the country that is not in need of more capital. The plight of the railroads is notorious. They need billions. The shortage of housing is acute in most of our large cities. Billions of capital are needed to supply this want. Our export trade, for several years to come, will have to be financed in part through the absorption by American investors of foreign securities. This will require billions. Additional billions will be required for the expansion of the thousand and one varieties of staple manufacturing and trading. In such fields the amount of excess profits taxable under the law is inconspicuous. Any railway investor would be overjoyed at a prospect of earnings rich enough to yield anything for the excess profits tax; and the same thing is true of practically every other investor in the branches of industry and trade whose product is imperatively required.

If we had a vast volume of capital looking vainly for profitable investment, if we had a serious problem of unemployment pressing upon us, there would be strong grounds for encouraging new enterprises, by raising the percentage of exempted income, or otherwise. That is not our present condition. Both capital funds and labor supply are short. In war time every government found it desirable to check speculative and unessential ventures because there was not productive power enough for the essential uses. We have not so completely recovered from the war that there is no further object in giving priority to essential uses. That is in effect what the excess profits tax does, in so far as it holds back the uncertain, though possibly very profitable ventures and confines investment to the well tried fields. It makes for less brilliant operations, but for a saner and more secure general condition of business. And one must be very confident indeed in the solidity of the present business boom to denounce such a sobering influence as inherently undesirable.

On Behalf of Louis F. Post

THE public should understand clearly what it is that has brought down upon Assistant Secretary of Labor Post the wrath of the Inquisitors at Washington.

Mr. Post is, in the absence of Secretary Wilson, the acting head of the Department of Labor, and under the law is charged with the duty of deciding what aliens come within the classes proscribed by the deportation laws. In the course of his duties there came before him the case of one Thomas Truss, President of one of the locals of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America at Baltimore, a Pole by nationality, married, and with three American-born children. Truss was arrested on January 7th, without a warrant, locked up for the night, and his family were kept in ignorance of his whereabouts till the following day. He was examined without being apprised of his constitutional rights, a deportation warrant was made out, and he was held in $1,000 bail. For a week he was in custody, before he was able to raise the required sum. So much for the "due process" of his arrest.

The facts, found by Mr. Post from the official record, are that Truss is a man of excellent character, and an elder of the St. Paul's Polish Church. Six years ago he was a member of the I. W. W., that being the only union in his shop, but he had resigned when the Amalgamated Clothing Workers were organized in 1914. He had been a member of a Russian educational and mutual benefit society, but had resigned when that society became merged in the Union of Russian Workers. He applied for membership in the Communist party, because he understood that it would stand for "socialization of mines, railroads, etc., thereby lowering prices as the Government Post Office had lowered postage;" but the branch which he and his associates formed disbanded without ever accepting a charter from the National Communist party, because they never received a copy of the constitution or an explanation of the purposes of the party. Nevertheless, Truss was ordered deported, on the advice of the Department of Justice.

Mr. Post has now cancelled the warrant for his deportation, on the ground that Truss was never even technically a member of the Communist party;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and upon the further ground that even if he had been a member, he had no guilty knowledge of the nature of the organization, and that "it appears not only that he is and has been wholly free from any hostile purpose toward this government, but that he is sympathetic with our democratic institutions."

That such an outrage could be perpetrated by government officials upon a single individual is ominous enough, in a country brought up upon democratic traditions. But it was not a sporadic and exceptional case.

"I have described this case at length," continues Mr. Post, "because in most if not in all essentials it is typical of a large proportion of fully 1,000 cases I have decided after hearings in which warrants of arrest had been issued by the Department of Labor on prima facie proof of probable cause furnished by special agents of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice. The aliens are arrested and imprisoned; while imprisoned they are subjected to a police-office inquisition; an affidavit showing probable cause (upon information and belief) is thereupon presented to the Department of Labor, whereupon the Department of Labor issues its warrant of arrest, takes over the custody of the alien, as by law it is required to do, and proceeds as usual in warrant cases under the expulsion clause of the immigration law. When the hearings at immigration stations are reported verbatim in regular course to the Department of Labor, the Secretary of Labor (or his lawful representative) who is charged with the exclusive responsibility, comes to examine these records, it is found in a large proportion of the large number of cases I have examined that there is no better reason for deportation than is disclosed in the present case. In some cases the membership is "automatic," the arrested alien having been transferred from a lawful organization to the unlawful one by vote of a group or branch of the former and without his knowledge. In some cases he has had knowledge of the transfer but none at all of the character of the organization to which he has been transferred. In other cases he has signed applications before the existence of the unlawful organization and has never confirmed his membership by any conscious act. Sometimes an organizer or a friend has signed the application for him. As a rule, the hearings show the aliens arrested to be working men of good character who have never been arrested before, who are not anarchists or revolutionists, nor politically or otherwise dangerous in any sense. Many of them, as in this case, have American-born children. It is pitiful to consider the hardships to which they and their families have been subjected during the past three or four months by arbitrary arrest, long detention in default of bail beyond the means of hard working wage earners to give, for nothing more dangerous than affiliating with friends of their own race, country and language, and without the slightest indication of sinister motive, or any unlawful act within their knowledge or intention."

Such is Mr. Post's description of the raids which were to carry Mr. Palmer into the Presidential chair. If it is a fabrication, Post should be impeached; but if it is true, Congress is impeaching the wrong man. That it is a true picture of the raids is borne out not only by the individual instances which have come to light in the past, but by important and unimpeachable evidence which has now been brought out before Judge Anderson in the federal district court in Boston. In the trial of habeas corpus proceedings affecting a dozen or more deportees, the federal officers have been compelled to produce the instructions under which they acted in rounding up the alleged Reds, and they show that the outrages were not only authorized but premeditated.

Especially illuminating are the instructions sent by the Department of Justice to the local officers at Boston, (and presumably to the other local officers throughout the country as well), on December 27th last, in preparation for the raid of January 2nd, 1920. They are instructed to "place under surveillance" persons who are charged in affidavits with being alien members of the Communist or Communist Labor party. When they are apprehended, "every effort should be made by you to definitely establish (sic) the fact" that the suspects are members of these organizations. All books and records should be seized. The residences of officers should be searched for "literature, membership cards, records and correspondence." "All literature, books, papers and anything hanging on the walls should be gathered up; the ceilings and partitions should be sounded for hiding places." The aliens themselves should be searched, and "if found in groups in meeting rooms, they should be lined up against the wall and there searched."

Then comes the following, which is worth quoting verbatim:

"I have made mention above that the meeting places and residences of the members should be thoroughly searched. I leave it entirely to your discretion as to the method by which you should gain access to such places. If, *due to the local conditions in your territory,* you find that it is absolutely necessary for you to obtain a search warrant for such premises, you should communicate with the local authorities a few hours before the time for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the arrests is set and request a warrant to search the premises."

We wonder what the "local conditions" were that might make a search warrant "absolutely necessary." Of course, the Constitution of the United States makes a forcible entry and search without a warrant illegal, but Mr. Palmer's Assistant Director and Chief, who signed the message, would hardly refer to the Constitution as a "local condition." He must have meant some unusually scrupulous federal judge, who might enforce the Constitution, or, perhaps, merely a sensitive public attitude toward infringements on civil liberty. At all events the local officials were granted, and as the events shows they exercised entire discretion.

One final excerpt from this extraordinary document. "If possible," the district attorney is instructed, "you should arrange with your undercover informants to have meetings of the Communist party and the Communist Labor party held on the night set. I have been informed by some of the bureau offices that such arrangements will be made. This, of course, will facilitate the making of the arrests." Even the agent provocateur, that favorite of the Tsar's secret police, finds his appropriate place in Mr. Palmer's machinery.

Now that this damaging document has become public property, it is hardly probable that Congressmen will press their threatened impeachment proceedings. Not, at least, against Mr. Post. But it is to be hoped that the matter will not be allowed to rest. A thorough investigation by a Congressional committee of infringements of civil liberty by federal officials since the armistice will be the only way to demonstrate that the virus of Palmerism has not spread to every branch of the federal government.

Moses Against Moscow

THE report on Mr. Martens and Russian propaganda by Senator Moses is one of those documents—now exceeding numerous—in which the Red menace is answered by a black panic and a flight from the field.

This report is at variance with Senator Moses's own personally expressed views of the testimony taken before his committee—and at variance with the testimony's manifest meaning. Even the New York Times is unable to swallow Senator Moses's scrambled and poisoned hashing of that meaning. The Senator from New Hampshire occupies the almost unique position of being able to reveal Bolshevik plots which the editor of the New York Times cannot bring himself to credit.

We may further note that Senator Moses rushed his report to the printer while the attorney for Mr. Martens was still occupied—after conversations with Senator Moses—in preparing his argument on the testimony and in collecting his answer to various allegations which Senator Moses had refused to allow him to disprove by the summoning of witnesses. We may note still further that Senator Moses's Committee, although it was empowered by the Senate to investigate the Bolshevik representative Mr. Martens and the anti-Bolshevik representative Mr. Bakhmetev, adjourned after investigating Mr. Martens and did not investigate Mr. Bakhmetev.

The theory on which Senator Moses proceeded was to begin his inquiry by simulating an intention of impartiality and to end it by denying to Mr. Martens an opportunity of full reply, by omitting to reveal the scandalous propagandist use of American loans by Mr. Bakhmetev, and by writing a report worthy of a justice-shop run by a backwoods justice of the peace owned by a lumber company. We may observe, for instance, that a critical document never actually introduced into the testimony to be examined and rebutted by Mr. Martens's attorney is on page nine of the report actually introduced by Senator Moses into his findings and conclusions.

Senator Moses has added himself to the long list of Europeans and Americans who, in their efforts to check communism not by facing it but by defacing it, have been willing to abandon their brains and have become the laughing-stocks of a Moscow which their absurdities help to strengthen and stones of stumbling to their own countrymen whom now in the course of two and a half years of maundering mendacity against Moscow they have led to fall after fall and to failure succeeding failure.

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1920, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY — CHARLES MERZ
FRANCIS HACKETT — WALTER LIPPMANN
ALVIN JOHNSON — PHILIP LITTELL
SIGNE TOKSVIG, Assistant Editor

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Line-Up in Iowa

IOWA'S farmer, long a convenient symbol for everything resoundingly conservative in politics, is actually approaching a political alliance with union labor.

To get full measure of what is happening in the state today it is necessary to recall the situation which existed during the war. In common with other states of the Middle West, Iowa paid the penalty for an early pacifism by falling into the hands of its own jingoes. There was a handy instrument of coercion they could use. Iowa was one of the states that relied upon the Individual Allotment. Loans made in the name of Liberty were raised by compulsion. It was no system of representative taxation. War committees appointed from on high decided the individual minimum, and proceeded by one means or another to go get it. Sometimes the threat of being charged pro-German was enough. But Iowa had many times more than its share of physical coercion. There were whipping parties. Country churches with congregations suspiciously unpatriotic were burned to the ground. Members of official war bodies made open threats of violence. When the Secretary of the Treasury protested against the method of the Individual Allotment, his letter, read to an assembly of Iowa committeemen by a quaking representative, was booed and hooted.

It is against this background that any present events in Iowa should be measured. The background, of course, is still prominent. No armistice was signed in Iowa on the 11th of November, 1918. The war done, today's battle is against Bolshevism. And first in peace, as first in war, stands the Greater Iowa Association.

The Greater Iowa Association is a sort of National Security League, American Defense Society and National Civic Federation rolled in one. It represents that sort of "substantial business interest" which battles, in New York, against the Bolshevism of minimum wage laws for women earning $9 a week, and in Iowa crusades against anything that tampers with existing standards. What a frame of mind it is in, perhaps this statement of its General Secretary will indicate. He is describing, not the Communist Labor party, but the Committee of 48:

> Lenin's thumb-print is on the birth certificate of the "Committee of 48"—that infant political cure-all which recently has been appealing for converts—and cash—and which purports to be a combination of "liberal thinkers," whatever that may mean. The waif would have died at birth, had not Lajpat Rai of India breathed into its lungs the unrest of Asia. America's leading radicals served as wet nurses—and today it is being palmed off as a child of political respectability. The "Red" parents are behind the screen; they had hoped the general public would never learn their secret—for there is something in heredity, after all.

Intent upon carrying its crusade to every available front the Greater Iowa Association goes about its task with thoroughness. A purse has been raised to fight radicalism. There are field secretaries to manage the local campaign; tracts to expose every progressive force in America; "The Famous Hillis Lectures" (Newell Dwight Hillis)—"superbly illustrated with colored stereopticon views"—now made "available for general distribution . . . . . printed in large type"— all ready for the amateur lecturer. Iowa, a predominantly agricultural state, is getting anti-Bolshevism in doses large enough to inoculate a Paterson, New Jersey, expanded to Iowa's size.

Lightning from Moscow may indeed be about to strike a state where seventy per cent of the population lives on the land—and where land values are the highest in the country. Successful newspapers like the Des Moines Register and the Des Moines News do not think so. They openly assail the character of the anti-Bolshevist crusade. Part of the impetus for that crusade is, no doubt, an unexpended war emotion. But part of it is objective. The Greater Iowa Association, and the opinion of which it is a spearhead, sees a threat to the profitable status quo. It is not communism that is threatening. Only a brave and misguided man will stump Iowa's farms today in the interest of land nationalization. The threat to the status quo comes from a different quarter. It is the threat of an attack upon the institution of privately and competitively managed distribution.

In Iowa, as in other parts of the Middle West, farmers are beginning to be sure that they are a long way from their markets, and that a shorter way may lie through direct cooperation with producers who live in the cities. It was a similar conclusion, several years ago, that put the Nonpartisan League in the field in North Dakota; for a discussion of the economic phases of the same question the All-American Farmer-Labor Cooperative Congress met recently in Chicago. Much that is essential to the union of urban and rural producer can be accomplished extra-governmentally, through the farmer's association and the cooperative exchange. There is part of the program that only

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political action can achieve. (Witness the fact that Iowa farmers are now waiting for Congress to take action on a bill that will go only so far as to make cooperative distribution of their crops a legal practice.) Both in the economic and political fields, farmers and city workers have been held apart from joint action. Reactionary leaders on both sides, outside interests profiting from the present order of competitive distribution—Minneapolis grain dealers, Greater Iowa Associations and their like—have built between the two groups the conviction that their economic interests were mutually antagonistic.

What is interesting in Iowa today is just this: in a conservative and hysteria-scarred state the farmers and trade unions are actually cutting through the wall that separates them.

The Iowa farmer, despite the attention lavished on him by the Greater Iowa Association, is apparently as little concerned about Bolshevism as he is about the valley of the Saar. The farmer, in common with everyone else, feels the burden of the strike. And the reactionary leaders of national farm organizations have capitalized the farmer's irritation. At its recent meeting in Chicago the National Farm Bureau Federation adopted a resolution asserting:

> We declare the strike no longer justifiable, no longer to be tolerated by a long-suffering public.

The Federation went on to advocate the establishment of arbitration courts. It did not want the industrial worker left entirely in the cold. But his one effective weapon of redress, at the present time, it unequivocally condemned.

Note, in contrast to this attitude, what happened to a similar resolution when the Iowa State Farm Bureau Federation met in the city of Des Moines. Certain leaders of the state organization submitted a resolution unreservedly condemning strikes. A delegate from the southern part of the state, Colonel Brookhart, took the floor in opposition. He pointed out the interests labor and the farmer have in common. He asserted that reactionary interests are praising Heaven for their present opportunity of playing one against the other. He pointed out that when Illinois farmers held back their milk from an unfair market, they were striking with results as harsh as ever an industrial strike can cause. He called upon the representatives of Iowa's farmers to beat any resolution condemning union labor. The resolution was beaten.

This action of the Iowa Federation opened the gate for further cooperation between the Iowa farmer and the trade unionist; and through that gate the same Colonel Brookhart has already stepped. On the issue of a political and economic alliance between labor and the farmer he will contest the Republican primaries of June 7th, a candidate for Mr. Cummins's job in the United States Senate. He has a past that ought to make him politically available in Iowa: farmer, lawyer, associate of Clifford Thorne, on behalf of farmers and shippers, in the rate cases before the Interstate Commerce Commission. He is out for repeal of the Cummins-Esch law. It is likely to be a profitable issue. Iowa farmers (it takes no great amount of research to discover this) are not yet clamoring for the Plumb Plan; there are plenty of them, however, who shy at the Cummins plan of basing freight rates on a capitalization they believe to be well watered. Colonel Brookhart proposes repeal of the Cummins-Esch law, enactment of the plan Senator Cummins himself presented to the Iowa legislature in March of 1919 (the government to acquire title to the railways, operation to be by private companies with a nominal capital). Other planks in Colonel Brookhart's program include such issues as unemployment insurance and revision upward of the Rural Credits law. The major plank, however, is the issue which projected Colonel Brookhart into politics and which makes his candidacy something more than an inter-party contest: "The farmers must organize and lead the great movement of cooperation, both economically and politically. To succeed they must find a common cause with all producing labor of hand and brain."

Members of two farmers' organizations proposed Colonel Brookhart for the nomination; it is still another sign that labor and the farmers are moving into partnership in Iowa, that the trade unions have announced their support of Colonel Brookhart's candidacy. It is not the support of a few locals, but of the three great union bodies meeting in convention—the brotherhoods, the Mine Workers of America (District No. 13), and the Iowa State Federation of Labor. Trade unions in Iowa, it is worth noting, are acquiring a lively political interest. A week or two ago there were municipal elections in Iowa. Union labor won in Sioux City, Waterloo and Burlington. In each of these cities the candidate of the trade unions was elected mayor. In Clinton the Labor party made its first appearance. It elected the mayor; and, with two exceptions, won every other office in the city. Today, in different parts of Iowa, there is cooperation between these successful trade unionists and representatives of the farmers.

The coalition may fail to win, in 1920. It is hard to get farmers to leave their fields in June and go to the primaries; it is hard to get labor voters who have voted other tickets in the past to go through the red tape of changing their party

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

affiliations. But win or lose, Colonel Brookhart's candidacy will leave a mark. He is running on a G. O. P. ticket. But with the support of that liberal and powerful journal, the Iowa Homestead, he is working to convert labor and the farmers to an effective coalition. He is making his effort, not in a state where crops are sparse and the soil barren; but in a state where farm land has recently sold as high as $800 an acre. That makes his experiment all the more worth watching.

CHARLES MERZ.

Why Shoes Are Dear

THE other day my boy, aged sixteen, went to a Washington store and paid $13.50 for a pair of shoes. In response to some weak protestations he declared they were "the same kind and price the other fellows get." It occurred to me that if all "the other fellows" were paying such prices for shoes it helped explain why so small a percentage of youngsters go to high school. The thirteen-fifty might possibly worry other parents as much as myself.

I mentioned the incident to a friend and he told me this:

Recently a New England shoe manufacturer and his wife came here. She snagged her shoe and had to buy a new pair. She hunted up a store, paid $18 for a pair, and went back to the hotel to tell her husband.

"What! Eighteen dollars?" he demanded. "Why, I get only $7 for that shoe."

He took the name of the Washington dealer, and wrote home to his sales department to have an inquiry made.

"I'm going to trace that shoe from my shop to your feet," he told his wife, "and put the price mark on each rung of the ladder by which it has gone up from $7 to $18."

While he is engaged in his inquiry, I want to tell some things the government has been discovering about shoes. Last autumn a Senate Committee, headed by Senator Ball of Delaware, inquired into prices of commodities in Washington. It took about 1,000 pages of testimony, some of it relating to shoes.

One witness was Mr. Herbert Rich, of B. Rich's Sons, shoe retailers. His statement may be summarized.

Year	Capital Invested	Gross Sales	Net Profits
1914	$ 77,759.22	$171,432.05	$ 2,044.63
1917	95,222.74	259,691.10	18,743.75
1918	111,924.54	422,838.78	64,743.52

The profits of 1918, $64,743.52, remained after paying every expense, taxes, excess profits taxes, and salaries of $5,200 each to two partners.

Several other Washington shoe dealers made like financial statements. They agreed that the rule, in fixing the retail price, was to add 66⅔ per cent to the cost of shoes. There might be variations, but that was the standard.

I wondered whether that spread of 66⅔ per cent for profit was unusual; whether retailers elsewhere took so much. So I went to the Federal Trade Commission. It published, last August, an exhaustive report on the shoe business generally, starting with hides and tanning, and following out all the processes from skinning the cow to skinning the customer. I had long known of that report, but had never heard of anybody reading it. I suspect even now that its reading public is composed entirely of myself. Anyhow, when a copy was presented to me—180 Saharan pages of tabulated statistics—I realized that it was destined never to be a best seller. Now, after many hours of midnight oil, I can at least testify that it ought to be.

They sent me with the report to Mr. T. M. Robertson, who, having managed the investigation, was presumably its best interpreter. Would he furnish me the key to it? He would!

First, then, was the percentage of profits taken by the Washington retailers unusual?

No, it was not. The investigation covered operations of retailers from New England to Texas and Colorado. The Washington margin of profit was somewhat above the mean, but not much.

That much settled, Mr. Robertson proceeded to irrigate some selected areas of the report's aridity; and presently it blossomed. I culled a few of the blooms, which I will try to press in these pages.

I wanted to know what the retailer had paid for those $13.50 shoes; what the wholesaler, before him, had paid for them; what the manufacturer, back of that, had paid for their making; and, finally, what the leather and labor in them had cost. I had heard much about labor-union profiteering; and, as labor in the shoe industry is highly organized, this would doubtless be a good opportunity to demonstrate how the labor barons rob us.

I decided to pick out a shoe that retailed for $13.50 and, tracing it back through all the stages, learn how much of the $13.50 was taken out at each stage, and, finally, how much had been the original cost of materials and labor in it.

At the outset I was balked. The report, based on business facts of 1918, did not deal with any man's shoe costing so much as $13.50. Shoes had plainly been going up since the report was prepared.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

However, I found a "man's black calf" shoe that, in 1918, had sold at $12, and started with it, back through the maze of merchandising and manufacturing processes. Year by year that shoe had—

	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918
Cost the dealer....	$4.50	4.65	5.15	7.25	8.00
Sold for	6.50	7.00	8.00	12.00	12.00
Per cent profit....	44.44	50.54	55.34	65.51	50.00

With this summary of retailing history, I turned to the report on manufacturers' costs, selling prices and profits. I found a man's shoe of like style, which the manufacturer sold, in 1914, for $4.508. The manufacturer's statistical report on it was:

	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918
Cost the manufacturer	$3.665	3.875	4.054	6.283	6.036
Sold for	4.508	4.655	5.145	7.350	7.35

With this summary of the merchandising history, I set out to learn its manufacturing costs. This is what the manufacturer said were its elements of cost:

	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918
Leather	$2.035	2.150	2.330	4.092	3.608
Other materials ..	.301	.341	.372	.498	.609
Labor	.878	.883	.887	1.046	1.177

These figures seemed to indicate that there was something wrong with the explanation that labor's extortions were causing the increased cost of shoes. Between 1914 and 1918, the cost of leather had increased 77.297 per cent; of other materials, 102.325 per cent; of labor, only 34.055 per cent. In percentages, leather had increased more than twice as much as labor, and other materials three times as much.

Leather advanced very greatly from 1914 to 1917; in most shoes, the leather cost in this period increased over 50 per cent; in a considerable proportion, over 100 per cent.

Then the government set about regulating leather prices, and they went down; the majority of shoes represented less leather cost in 1918 than in 1917.

In 1914, the Commission states, "leather constituted from 50 to 70 per cent of the total cost of all shoes, except infants'; by 1917 this percentage had increased to about 60 to 75 per cent."

Labor, of course, has been pampered during the war, and since. Everybody knows that, but like many other things that "everybody knows" it seems not exactly true. The Trade Commission report says on this point:

"There was considerable increase in labor cost in 1917 over 1914, but this factor did not increase at nearly as great a rate as either leather or other materials. Of the forty-seven comparable grades of shoes here under consideration, forty-four grades had an increase of less than twenty per cent; twenty-three had an increase of less than ten per cent."

We have seen that leather cost, in 1914, $2.035, and in 1918, $3.608. Was that a fair rate of increase?

The Trade Commission discusses hides and tanning at some length. It says that in 1914 "the industry as a whole was prosperous." For fifty tanning companies the average earning on investment in 1914 was 12.9 per cent, and in 1917 it was 25.7 per cent. That is, earnings on capital in tanning had increased almost exactly 100 per cent, while the earnings of labor had increased only 34 per cent. In 1916 and 1917 "most of them (the tanning concerns) earned from more than 20 to as high as 40, 50 and 60 per cent (on investment) and some even higher."

The beginning of all shoes is the hide. Between 1914 and 1917 prices of hides advanced greatly. There are two kinds of hides, packer hides, which are taken from cattle in big slaughtering establishments, and country hides, taken off by butchers and farmers.

"The five large meat packers," says the Commission, "have become a considerable factor in the leather business." They own and operate tanneries, and have large quantities of leather tanned under contract in outside tanneries. "In 1917 Armour & Company produced in its own tanneries one-fifteenth of all the sole leather in the United States. Another packer (Swift & Company) is a very large producer of upper leather. . . . . They can place every tanner using the more desirable grades of hides . . . . in a position of paying the price they ask or risking further competition from them. They may not be able to put a tanner out of business at once, but they have the power to do it."

About half the leather made in this country is from imported hides, and mostly from the foreign slaughtering establishments owned by American packers. The Trade Commission reports that during the war, when the price of leather reached unprecedented figures, the packers had in storage the largest quantities of hides ever held in the history of the trade. Leather was one of the most necessary articles of both civilian and military use. The packer contribution to winning the war included this cornering of hides in order to boost their price.

We have seen that shoes for which the wearer paid $12, cost to manufacture, $6.036. The difference, $5.964, was the cost of getting the finished shoe from factory to feet. The real question is, ought it to cost $5.964 to get $6.036 worth of shoes from maker to wearer? The Trade Commission answers:

"There can be no justification f[or] prices being as high as they have been; and th[e] [ow]ners, manu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

facturers and retail dealers made profits not warranted by the circumstances."

Mr. Robertson testified before Senator Ball's Committee:

"The conditions of the retail merchandising business are very uneconomical. There are two or three times as many people, in my judgment, engaged in the retail business as should be. . . . . They are making their living, and the public is . . . . paying two or three times as many people to serve it as are necessary."

"You do not think, then," asked Senator Capper, "that the increased number of retail merchants causes any competition that would bring down prices?"

"It is difficult for me," replied Mr. Robertson, "to escape the conclusion that the greater the number of retail merchants the higher the prices go."

When I put the same questions to him personally, he said he believed it would be nearer the truth to state that five times as many people are making a living out of the retail shoe business as would be necessary to serve the public. This, of course, connotes that other retailing expenses are likewise excessive—rent, capital investment, insurance, fixtures, advertising, and many more.

The shoe business peculiarly lives to itself. Shoes are made by people who commonly make nothing else; sold by jobbers who commonly handle shoes alone; retailed by retailers who retail shoes alone. There is no impossible complex of allocating percentages of costs to other articles made or handled in the same establishments.

"A hairpin," Mr. Robertson observed, "is a very simple thing compared to a shoe; but it would be harder to fix a fair price for hairpins than for shoes, because hairpins are inextricably intermingled with everything else that makes up the business of a dry-goods or department store, and cost-accounting is not a perfect science. Shoes, more than almost any other staple of universal necessity, flow in their own course all the way along."

From all the data examined, it appears that the farmer who produces the hide could be paid as much for it as he is being paid; the tanning business could be given a sufficient profit to keep capital engaged in it; the manufacturer and wholesaler could be given reasonable profits; the retailer could be amply rewarded;—and then, by eliminating wastes and excessive profits, the average cost of shoes to the consumer could be reduced one-third.

The shoes for which my boy paid $13.50 could have been sold for $9.00 and under an efficient system there would still have remained a margin from which somewhat to increase the pay of labor.

This conclusion is based on the Trade Commission's report and the hearings before the Senate Committee. It is the conclusion of people far better qualified than myself to analyze these data; including the Commission's experts. Moreover, wholesalers, retailers, and some manufacturers agreed that the quality of shoes of the same nominal grade has greatly deteriorated while prices have advanced.

Mr. Robertson's report and the Senate Committee's investigation have been available for criticism for several months, and have not been attacked. True, the Federal Trade Commission is under assault, but the assailants have been careful not to let the public know too much about the specific grounds for their grievances against it.

I have ventured that the price of shoes could be reduced one-third without driving capital out of the business. Doubtless, if such a counsel of perfection were applied in the shoe business alone, the statement would not be justified. If capital and management were forbidden the profitable privileges of laissez-faire in shoes, but allowed to continue them in ships and sealing wax and cabbages—kings are perhaps a bit too hazardous, at the moment!—undoubtedly capital and management would withdraw from shoes and go into enterprises in which the "good old" lawlessness of supply and demand continued to hold sway. But on the assumption of extending like treatment to other businesses, and restricting the earnings of capital to, say, three times the rate on liberty bonds, and limiting the emoluments of management to something like the figures at which government enlists executive brains, it could be done.

Nor do I despair of the possibility that something of the kind will be done. During the war the British government bought huge reserves of leather and wool, and in the step-by-step advance of regulation on the entrenchments of profiteering at length established control over the whole process of producing shoes and clothing. Not all shoes, nor all clothing; but certain styles and qualities. The government fixed prices on the raw materials; made schedules of allowance for all the successive processes in manufacture, first of leather and fabrics, later of the shoe and the suit of clothes, until the shoes or the suit reached the retailer's shelves with a government price-tag attached.

In that case, government intrusion was dictated by the purpose to warn private business. It served so well that since the war's end the demand of radicals, or laborites, or Bolsheviks, or whatever they should be called—thinkers, may be—for its continuance has become one of the urgent influences in the politico-economic thought of the nation. We

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may not be so far, therefore, as sanity and economic respectability might assume, from seeing such a policy tried out on a peace-time basis.

Not only does British experience with price regulation convince many students that it deserves projection into peace time, but the experience of America, which took the hobbles off business at the earliest possible moment, suggests the same thing. During 1918 the War Industries Board induced leather manufacturers to cut out the fancy colors—everything except black, tan and gray. The height of shoes was also limited. Immediately there was reduction in cost. "Manufacturers' costs" had steadily advanced from 1914 to 1917, but 1918 saw them reduced on about half the shoes reported. War Industries and Trade Commission officials recognize that regulation did this.

But the instant restrictions were removed, prices shot upward so fast that they soon reached the point that would have been attained if there had been no regulation. They are still going up. In fact, if the Commission's figures could be projected down to the present time, instead of ending in 1918, they would almost certainly have justified the statement that shoes are now costing the wearer, not one-third more than they ought, but one-half.

Study of the whole process of production and distribution as a unity, scientific examination of its successive phases and of their articulation with one another, has been forced upon price controllers everywhere by this extraordinary episode in the business world. It has brought students to inquire whether old and accepted theories about business control by the state may have been wrong. Perhaps regulation, or, if necessary, community operation of business, should begin with distribution, rather than with production. Most radical thinkers have been wont to assume that, if government dipped into business in order to protect the public, it should start at the producing end. "Take over the shoe factories—the steel plants—the sugar trust—the big combines that control business" was the common demand. To have the government manage the shoe stores, the hardware stores, the groceries—that occurred to few as a practicable and perhaps much more helpful procedure.

But studies like this in shoes have brought many to change their opinions. Cooperative distribution of the Rochdale type is urged nowadays as a panacea, by people who five years ago would have called it a plague. Yet community merchandising, state distribution, municipal retailing, by whatever name you choose to call it, is not essentially different. The possibility that it may get a trial is forced upon whoever will study such investigations as this in shoes, or the British and American experiments in price fixing during the war.

JUDSON C. WELLIVER.

The Walkout on the Railroads

"THIS is not a strike; this is a vacation." Any visitor to the yards of Jersey City may receive this much of the striker's confidence. Further questioning of the men about their grievances, however, discloses the new technique of the American labor movement. It is the use of silence which is the most conspicuous characteristic of the striker's attitude.

It has been a pathetic sight to see representatives of the great city newspapers leaning against the wall, waiting hour after hour every day since the walkout began for a statement or a few minutes' interview with the strikers. But all the tricks of the "old hands" could not extract any information. "We have a committee delegated to talk for us," was the monotonous reply, and radical journals, with the single exception of the New York Call, did not fare better. A man from the Liberator came with the assurance that all workers knew his magazine, but apparently the Bolshevik trainmen of Jersey City had hardly heard of it, and so he had to remain outside. Then came the representative of a progressive New York labor paper of which, again, the strikers knew nothing. One reporter told Mr. McHugh (of the Executive Committee of the United Railway Workers of America) that he had to secure a statement or his paper would discharge him. "Well," McHugh replied, "I am not here to adjust differences between newspapers and their employees."

And then, when one is fortunate enough to talk to members of the Executive Committee, to visit their social club, and to discuss the causes of the walkout, one finds that the significance of it all is that it is a true rank and file movement and that the chairman and members of the executive committee are made of the same clay with the workers. "The movement was in progress two days before I had anything to do with any committee," the chairman told me. And so it was with the rest of the officers.

The walkout of the trainmen is of the same

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stamp as the strikes of the New York Harbor shipyard workers, the Printing Pressmen's Union, the strike of Railway Shopmen, and other unauthorized walkouts which occurred last year in strongly organized trades. The present movement resembles these, and recalls the great influence of the rank and file in the steel strike and the coal strike, in its same demand for higher wages and better living conditions, the same dissatisfaction with union leaders for not having been firmer in making demands of the government. As the chairman of the committee puts it, "For the last eighteen months wage boards have been appointed, and have done nothing to improve our conditions. The Brotherhood chiefs have failed to adjust the demands presented in August, 1918, just as the government has failed to grant them."

It was in a small room on the top floor of the Trainmen's Club in Jersey City that Edward McHugh described to me the conditions which brought about this situation. McHugh is vice president of a local Trainmen's lodge. "It was entirely spontaneous," he said; "it came to us all at once. None of us knew when it would come but we were all dissatisfied. The Board of Mediation and Conciliation has done nothing for us. The eight-hour law has not helped us very much either. A tour of duty often extends up to sixteen hours and many of the men work much longer. The joker in the law is that it can be evaded by punching the clocks ten minutes before the sixteenth hour is up, and in that way the men can be made to work as much as eight hours longer. That makes twenty-four hours; and you know that it is too much for a man to work twenty-four hours. As for wages, the cost of living makes it impossible to support a family on five dollars a day. That is why, to speak frankly, many of the men are actually forced to work sixteen hours a day in order to be able to maintain their families."

He spoke with the good common sense of a plain American workingman. He is of medium height, rather stout, bald, gray-eyed, deliberate of speech and continually chews tobacco. This is the rebel and outlaw pictured by the daily papers for the last six or seven days. Against the conditions he described the men have appealed again and again. The government has done nothing for them. The delays and disappointments have accumulated dissatisfaction with their own grand officers for their apparent indifference toward the situation. The archaic form of organization makes it impossible for the men to force their officers into any action.

When we come to examine the methods left open to the rank and file in the Brotherhoods for controlling the activities of the officers we find that these are few. The form of organization is so centralized that they have hardly any choice except to revolt or to endorse the moves of their leaders. One of the delegates to a convention of the Trainmen's organization explained that the only reason why W. G. Lee, the grand officer, was still in office was that no machinery existed for recalling him and no man was strong enough to stand as a candidate against him. In thirty years the order of the Trainmen-Railwaymen has had only three grand officers, Lee being the third. "We have no referendum," he said, "and no voice in the making of any contract. The contracts under which we work are made by the grand officers. The only thing we do is to vote on propositions of strikes, and even when we vote for a strike, the Brotherhood chiefs decide the question as they see fit. Our delegates to conventions go unpledged. We have no method of pledging our delegates for whom to vote, and no leader strong enough to fight the machinery of the central organization."

In adjusting local conditions the men have no more to say than in general matters. Through grievance committees, local and general, the question is referred to the grand officer. The local grievance committees are composed of three men from each lodge of each road. The general committees are composed of the chairmen of all the local committees. When some condition arises with which the men are dissatisfied they have a right to appeal to the local committee. The local committee members, being actual workers, are as a rule afraid to take a determined stand for fear of being discharged. They present their grievance to the superintendent, who does very little. Then the men can appeal to the general committee, with whom they do not fare much better. From here the matter can be taken to the grand officers, who are the court of last resort. "We want," said a young striker, "a 'walking delegate' who is independent of his job; and who can talk up to the superintendent of the road."

The feeling exists among all the rank and file that there has come a time for a rewording of their old constitutions, since these no longer respond to actual conditions. It is not so much that the men are against a centralized form of organization as that they want consideration for their demands. Their ideas of what the new form of organization should be are not clear, but they are quite clear in their conviction that the grand officers have not kept in touch with their needs; that they have not been active enough; that they have compromised too much; that they have taken no effective meas-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ures to improve their situation. A few months ago petitions were circulated among the different lodges in the Trainmen's Union demanding a special convention with the object of removing one of their own grand officers. This question was still pending when the walkout intervened.

Rumors have been circulated that the Brotherhood chiefs knew that the men were preparing to strike, and did nothing to prevent it, with the motive of letting it fail by coming prematurely. However this may be, the attitude of W. G. Lee, President of the Railway Trainmen, is indicated by the following telegram sent to Congressman Cooper soon after the walkout began, asking that the government take measures against the men:

> Illegal strike of switchmen spreading all over the country regardless of efforts of officers. Brotherhoods and switchmen's unions only bona fide organizations entitled to represent yardmen. It seems strange that present laws against strikes of railroad employees can be used only against bona fide labor organizations that have supported the government at all times and made good their contracts with railroads. Must we understand that such laws do not apply to renegade organizations or those inciting illegal strikes?

This statement shows the temper of the Brotherhood chiefs towards the walkout.

A great deal has been said about the influence of the I. W. W. in this strike. Mr. Palmer came out on April 15th with the statement that this was "the latest and largest manifestation of the working out of the program of the International Communist party, which purposes to capture political and economic power, overthrow the government, establish a dictatorship of what they call the proletariat and ultimately transport to this country an exact reproduction of the chaotic conditions that exist in Russia." Mr. Palmer also is quoted as saying that "William Z. Foster, who acted as secretary of the steel strike committee, Carl Pearson and A. E. Reese and others of his associates in revolutionary parties are engaged in the effort to promote the present strike."

A visit to one of the strikers' halls in Jersey City or New York will convince anyone that a heavy majority of the strikers is all-American. In the few days I spent around the headquarters I hardly noticed a foreign accent. No I. W. W. spirit can be detected in the men's conversation. They know that conditions were insupportable, that their organization did not respond to the situation, and that their officers did not forward their demands. "Outlaws?" said one of the strikers. "Look at our stars here!" and he told me that fifteen thousand from the Brotherhood Trainmen had served in the great war. "Five hundred were killed in the war, that is the kind of outlaws we are," he added.

They have formed a new organization, it is true, but the "United Railway Workers of America," as it is called, is probably merely a temporary organization. It may in time, if the spirit of bitterness against the grand officers increases, separate entirely from the Brotherhoods. But as matters stand at present there is no intention of this kind.

Mr. McHugh showed me a telegram received from a Boston trainman asking him to come down and organize the trainmen there. When I asked him what he was going to do about it he said, "We are not mixing up with other movements; this is a local move for the Eastern railwaymen, and we don't mix up with the rest of the country." The men not only are not directed from any central point, but they have no knowledge of the walkout in Chicago which preceded theirs. About Socialist or I. W. W. theories most of them seem to have no idea. Very few have heard of the more important labor papers. The only radical journal which may have influenced some of them, and which a good many of them have read, is the organ of the Plumb Plan League, Labor. It could not be said, however, that the Plumb Plan League or any other league brought about the strike. The dissatisfaction of the rank and file and their neglect by their leaders were its predominating causes.

The general strike committee is composed of three representatives from each road for each craft, consisting of yardmasters, engineers, firemen, conductors, road workmen, and yard service men. From this general committee is elected an executive committee composed of fifteen men, including the secretary and the chairman. This executive committee is vested with power to conduct the strike and to make such moves as seem advisable to carry it to a successful end. In reality its powers are limited, and it takes no important action without the authority of a general meeting. This was shown on Tuesday, April 12th, when the committee was invited by the Mayor of Jersey City to hold a meeting with the chiefs of the Brotherhoods. At this meeting the union officials asked the men to return to work. Even if the committee had been disposed to accede to this request, it could not have acted without a vote of the men who are in the walkout.

The meeting which took place in the Mayor's office is especially interesting from the point of view of showing the great antagonism between the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

men and their former leaders. Mr. Timothy Shea, of the Locomotive Engineers, is supposed to have said in this meeting that the men were not loyal to their Brotherhood. One of the committee for the strikers answered, "Are you so much more loyal to the Brotherhood than to the country as a whole?"

In the same meeting Shea is reported to have said that the Brotherhoods were going to give a trial to the Esch bill. This statement indicates that the Brotherhoods are about to give up the fight against this bill, in spite of their declaration at the beginning of the walkout that they would resume it.

A strike on railways cannot last long. This strike in particular cannot last long for the simple reason that the men have no national organization. They are merely locally organized and they are not in touch with "vacationists" in other parts of the country.

The men may, perhaps, agree to go back to work in case the newly created Labor Board guarantees to take up their demands immediately. But there is one result which the walkout will surely achieve: it will show the grand officers of the respective organizations that they must give greater consideration to the wishes of their men. More than this, it means that in a very short time the grand officers may be removed. It may also be said with certainty that constitutions will be rewritten to include referendum and recall. The triennial conventions will be abolished. Reconstruction of the old organizations rather than formation of new ones is the general tendency of the movement. The men are bound to the old unions by definite financial interests in the form of insurance.

It is not the intention of the strikers to starve New York babies for lack of milk nor to interfere with the United States mail service. They have said again and again that if there are not sufficient crews to move the milk they will furnish crews for that purpose. Mr. McHugh said most emphatically that no food shortage would be allowed to occur. They will also furnish crews for the conduct of the United States mail service. But they want it understood that these privileges shall not be abused. For example, they are on the lookout that no mail cars shall be put on passenger trains, so that when they refuse to man the trains they may not be accused of interfering with the mail service of the United States.

This is not a revolution, or anything like a revolution; it is a walkout by American railwaymen for redress of ancient grievances.

S. ZIMAND.

Britain's Capital Levy

AMERICANS interested in the possibilities of increased taxation, or in the methods of public control of capital wealth, should not fail to get the elaborate essay just published by the British Government Stationery Office as Memoranda submitted by the Board of Inland Revenue to the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Increases of Wealth (War), Cmd. 594, price six pence. In this Parliamentary paper, which runs to some 40,000 words, we have a singularly convincing examination of the practicability of a Capital Levy—an expert official judgment by a government department of proved efficiency which cannot fail to exercise a marked effect on British government financial policy.

When the Inland Revenue Department says that a given tax is practicable, we in England know, not merely that it can be levied with success, but further that, if adopted by Parliament, the tax will be levied not only with the most scrupulous integrity but also with a universality, a courteous but absolutely unyielding rigor, and an impartiality equalled, it is probable, in no other part of the world. In view of American experience of taxes on property, and of the prospect of direct taxation proportionate to individual fortunes becoming a standing feature of national budgets, the proposals of the British Board of Inland Revenue merit consideration.

These proposals, it is carefully explained, have no official connection with what is called a Capital Levy, or taxation in proportion to all wealth; but only to the alternative suggestion of a tax on "War-Time Wealth," being the amount by which private fortunes have been increased during the war. In making this distinction the Board of Inland Revenue adopts a suggestion of Mr. J. A. Hobson, to whom it pays the compliment of citation by name. Before the war the aggregate amount of private fortunes in the United Kingdom was estimated at about eleven thousand million pounds. After the war, Dr. J. C. Stamp, who is our leading statistical authority on these matters, estimated the aggregate net increase in current market values at five and a quarter thousand million pounds, or nearly 48 per cent. The Board of Inland Revenue, going more minutely into the data, under slightly different conditions, puts the aggregate net increase in value between June 30th, 1914 and June 30th, 1919 at no more than four thousand million pounds, or 36 per cent. Of this "War Time Wealth," one third is supposed to be in the hands of people whose increase in fortune is less than 5,000 pounds; and among these about 170,000 persons (including families, say 1 per cent of the community) are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from 3,000 pounds to 5,000 pounds richer than they were.

Two-thirds of the aggregate net increase, or nearly three thousand million pounds, is computed to be in the hands of 340,000 persons (including families, say 2 per cent of the community), whose total post-war wealth is put at 9,100 millon pounds. No less than 6,000 million pounds of our present wealth, being two-fifths of the whole, is possessed by 73,500 individuals, each owning more than 25,000 pounds, who have secured among them over 2,000 million pounds of the increase, or half the total "War Time Wealth." Thus is body given to the popular vision of "War Profiteers!"

The 280 among them who now own more than a million pounds apiece have managed to get no less than 200 millions of war time increase, which has raised their aggregate possessions to close upon 600 million pounds sterling.

It is worth notice that these very authoritative estimates of the Board of Inland Revenue more than corroborate the current Socialist accusations as to the increasing aggregations of private wealth. Two out of every hundred families own two-fifths of all the private property of the nation; and to this two per cent has accrued two-thirds of the aggregate increase in wealth during the past five years. Those among them whom the Americans would call millionaires (viz. the 3,600 owning each at least a quarter of a million pounds) have taken no less than 700 million pounds of the increase. These figures will have dynamic effects.

It will be realized that the proposed taxation of "War Time Wealth," though directly affecting a smaller number of persons than a simple Capital Levy, presents all the difficulties and raises all the issues of the larger project. Even exempting all those whose fortunes have not grown at all, or have grown by less than 5,000 pounds, there will be no fewer than 340,000 persons to be assessed to the tax on "War Time Wealth," and, if we were to go down to those who have got richer by only 3,000 pounds, about 170,000 more. All these estates and investments have to be valued, but this causes the experienced Inland Revenue Department no dismay. It can carry through the whole business, even the double retrospective valuation at two different dates, and collect a thousand million pounds, for less than a couple of millions, actually cheaper in proportion than any of the existing taxes. All the difficulties are examined—land and houses, property in settlement or held in trust (one-seventh of the whole), individual businesses and private companies, insurance policies, furniture, jewelry, furs, mortgages, and what not—with practical schemes for rendering the whole operation easy to the taxpayer and safe for the government. Payment would be taken by instalments over ten years; but only at interest and with security. On the other hand, payment could be made in approved securities; and no forced realizations whatever would be rendered necessary.

It has come upon the propertied classes as a shock to hear it given in evidence by the Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue (who is reputed to be one of the very ablest of our civil servants) that, whilst a tax proportionate to "War Time Wealth" would present difficulties, none of these are insurmountable. If Parliament gives the word the department can carry the matter through next autumn. What is thus officially suggested is (a) a double valuation, as on June 30th, 1914 and 1919, of the wealth of every person whose fortune has increased by as much as 5,000 pounds, but of no others; (b) the exemption of all increases below that figure, and also of the first 2,000 pounds of everybody's increase, as an allowance to cover mere meritorious saving; (c) some other mitigations in respect of children etc; and (d) a tax on the 340,000 who have more than 5,000 pounds increase in wealth, graduated on a double scale, principally in proportion to the amount of each increment of war-time wealth, but slightly also in proportion to the total post-war wealth. Thus a man who possessed 150,000 pounds before the war, and has now 250,000 pounds, might be asked for 57,750 pounds. One who had 130,000 pounds before the war, and then 200,000 pounds, might find himself paying only 35,790 pounds. On a scale averaging 25 per cent (but varying from under 10 per cent up to just under 75 per cent of each man's "War Time Wealth." or quinquennial increase), the Board of Inland Revenue sees its way to raise no less than one thousand million pounds, which would enable the government to pay off more than one-eighth of the whole national debt; or, alternatively, in one or other way, to discharge its entire indebtedness to other countries.

Opinions differ, not only, as is natural, on the expediency of any new tax proportionate to individual capital wealth (the so-called Capital Levy); but also as to whether a tax proportionate only to the net increase in individual fortunes during the war (the tax on "War Time Wealth" now proposed) is any more justifiable than a tax proportionate to the whole of these fortunes. Those who "torpedoed" the Parliamentary move in favor of a Capital Levy, by a counter-project for a tax on "War Time Wealth," are wringing their hands. For, as they now see, the one is a Capital Levy just as much as the other; and it is a Capital Levy which strikes a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

specially demagogic note, satisfying the popular demand for vengeance on the profiteers, enlisting the support of the whole mass of country squires, idle rentiers, annuitants, large and small, the great bulk of the salaried class, and all who are suffering from high prices; and promising to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, merely by taxing those who are at least 5,000 pounds wealthier than they were, no less a sum than a thousand million pounds sterling. The present members of the House of Commons, of whom probably a half or two-thirds would find themselves liable to the tax, will not like it at all. But a budget which fails to include something of the sort will now be extremely unpopular. It is scarcely too much to say that, after the shattering effect of the by-elections of the last three months, the continuance in office of Mr. Lloyd George's government, or his return to power after the general election that may be upon us immediately after the budget, depends, to a very great extent, on these financial proposals.

To the economist and the administrator the scheme now officially worked out will be of special interest as indicating the extent and the methods by which the British government (which already knows more about each man's means than is commonly realized) will presently be equipped with a complete and extraordinarily accurate inventory of all the capital investments of every person possessing as much as a few thousand pounds. To the periodical glimpses of the amount and distribution of investments afforded by the death duties can now evidently be added a standing record, kept up to date from the annual returns for income tax and supertax, which the forthcoming proposals of the Royal Commission on the Income Tax will make even more exhaustive and compulsorily accurate than heretofore. It can be seen what class of investments attract particular sections; and who really owns our railways, our drinking saloons and our foreign investments. It will be possible for the government to watch the flow of capital hither and thither; and it may become increasingly difficult to refrain from judgment as to whether some urgent national service (for instance, the building of houses) is being adequately supplied, whilst other investments (for instance, foreign adventures in oil or mines) are drawing off more than should be spared. Doubtless Ricardo would have stared at the very thought of any interference; but it is not likely that nations will remain either indifferent or supine, when the scarcity of capital is realized, if investors continue to be governed exclusively by the prospect of high rates of interest to be gained in foreign parts.

SIDNEY WEBB.

They Must Have Espionage

THESE people who want to continue to have an economic despotism, they find that now they need a political despotism too. Observe them in Passaic.

The fight against industrial espionage in Passaic having been answered by a resolution of the Industrial Council of Passaic Wool Manufacturers defiantly continuing espionage, it then came about that the parallel fight against municipal censorship of free assemblage was answered by an ordinance of the Passaic City Council defiantly continuing censorship—and extending it.

The censorship of free assemblage in Passaic had been unauthorized. It had been unauthorized by the City Council. It had been volunteered by the Director of Public Safety out of his own personal sense of public safety. And it had been applied only to meetings of "radicals"—such as the Amalgamated Textile Workers.

Now we have an ordained municipal censorship in Passaic—ordained by full formal municipal legislative act; and it applies to all public meetings in Passaic—all.

Hereafter the right of free assemblage in Passaic—by anybody—is to be exercised only on "permit"—on "permit" beforehand—from the Director of Public Safety—an individual—who manages the police force. That is:

The constitutional right of *all* is to be exercised only through *previous permission* from *one*—and that one not a *judge* but a *policeman*.

It is the very definition of a relapse from political liberty to political despotism.

Why does its spirit spread so fast now among us? In Passaic there is quite a clear answer.

In Passaic certain industrial spies are outfitted with sets of typed instructions in which there appears the following paragraph:

"Attend meetings. Say where they are held. Give names of speakers and write up what they say. Mention number of men and women present. Furnish complete particulars and details concerning all meetings."

Finally comes the line: "Sign number here."

These inquirers report the conversations of their fellow-workers in the mills and report "all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meetings" and then sign their numbers and mail their reportings to a post-office lockbox.

Very well. There they are—along with others—all earnestly extending their ears. What have they flapped up? What have they revealed? What crimes by the Amalgamated, what plots for crimes, have they laid bare?

And the public detectives—the regular public detectives of the City of Passaic—what crimes and plots for crimes by the Amalgamated have been laid bare by them? They are headed by Captain Turner—a very wise officer.

I call him wise because I have seen him break up a meeting of textile workers with an affability—and yet with a perfect success—showing a long knowledge of men and their ways. He was under orders from the Director of Public Safety to drive those workers from that hall. He drove them. He caused them to be driven. But he explained. And he started no massacre. He used the precisely necessary amount of force—and no more—not a bit more. And there was no blood in his eye, and no blood on the floor, and the hall was cleared. It was a specimen of absolutely technically perfect police work—by Americans—not Cossacks. I take off a deferential hat to Captain Turner and his men.

They know the Passaic population. They have labored long at knowing it, both for themselves and also for the Department of Justice in search of "radicals."

In my last article I spoke of the Constitution of the Amalgamated Textile Workers and of the Preamble in which they aspire to a workers' world—a world of industries taken over by the workers. I will now report the two most desperate acts alleged to have been committed by the leaders of the Amalgamated in furtherance of the words of their preamble. These acts are more words.

One. A convention of the Amalgamated sent "greetings" to the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, telling that Republic that it is the only existing governmental system which guarantees "life, liberty and happiness" to the workers.

Two. Frank Latawiec said that the red flag would fly in the air of this country.

These are terrible words, but they butter no bombs. They have nothing to do with force or violence. They are constitutionally lawful.

In this country everybody has the right—yet—to say that the Russian form of government is best, or that the Japanese form is best, or that the British form is best; and many of our best citizens do not hesitate to say—especially to other best citizens—that the British form is best. And everybody in this country—in most parts of it—has the right to say—yet—that the flag which is everywhere the symbol of the Cooperative Commonwealth will some day proclaim the existence of that form—the Socialist form—of government in the United States. He has the right to say it, if he does not *do* it—or *conspire* to do it—by unlawful means.

Besides which, Frank Latawiec says that what he really said was that the red flag of Poland, with an eagle on it, would soon be brought over to this country as a national emblem by the new Polish minister to Washington and would be welcomed in our air by its host the Stars and Stripes; and he says that he remembers the incident because he remembers mentioning the eagle and that the gentleman—whoever he was—who reported his words—which were in Polish—caught the red flag all right but went off without the eagle. Therefore he must have been—judging from his methods—says Latawiec—a Wool Council spy.

In any case, Frank Latawiec and all the rest are quite unimprisoned and quite unindicted for any of their words about a flag or about Russia.

Such was the puzzle presented to the industrial and political authorities of Passaic. The local leader of the Amalgamated—Mr. Pluhar—and the local Polish organizer—Mr. Latawiec—were admittedly favorable to a proletarian industrial system and admittedly unfavorable to private ownership of woollen mills. But the authorities could not—and did not—jail them for those opinions. They could not proceed against them in law.

Therefore they proceeded against them without law. Therefore, in the person of the Director of Public Safety, they simply arbitrarily decreed that Frank Latawiec should not speak in public meetings in Passaic and that the Amalgamated Textile Workers should not hold public meetings in Passaic without a "permit."

It was Frank Latawiec who insisted on trying to translate the New Jersey Constitution into Polish at the meeting which Captain Turner broke up. Mr. Latawiec was several times pulled down from the platform—very gently—under Captain Turner's orders. But the spectacle—and the fame of it—was very upsetting to the authorities.

This sort of unlawfulness could not be continued. It had become grotesque as well as flagrant. Therefore the Director of Public Safety decided to legalize it. He introduced into the City Council an ordinance providing, in substance:

That if anybody in Passaic wants to have a street parade or a procession or a street assembly or a public meeting, he must notify the Director of Public Safety. That the Director of Public Safety

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be "satisfied that the same shall not be detrimental to the public interests." That if he is "satisfied," he shall issue a "permit." That if he is not "satisfied," then the street parade or the procession or the street assembly or the public meeting, as the case may be, is "forbidden."

Note well that no rules are laid down for the guidance of the Director of Public Safety in calculating "the public interests." He is not bound by any rules whatsoever, or precedents, or theories, or facts. He is to proceed by the incandescence of his own brain, just like the chieftain of a nomadic northern African tribe from whom I learned once that he was expected to assemble his tribesmen and declare some laws to them but that unfortunately he could not think of any.

The Director of Public Safety in Passaic having introduced his ordinance, there was a salvo of remonstrances.

The Passaic Daily News continued its assaults on the assaulters of ancient American liberties; and in the columns of the News there appeared a certain communication—well worth marking—from a certain local judge—Judge Cabell. It is pleasant to see a judge rising in his place to defend the concept of law—the concept of *law* and order, as distinguished from the concept of *government* and order. Judge Cabell said:

"Just at this time I consider such an ordinance unwise, when the public press has carried unfortunate statements attributed to public officers of this city to the effect that they would do certain things, and intended to pass an ordinance authorizing the doing of certain things, which men who have any knowledge of our system of free government know to be unlawful and tyrannical and provocative of riot and sedition."

It happened further that Hiram Johnson came to town, and passed rapidly through, on his touring way to the Chicago Convention. Some people told him about the low condition of the right of free assemblage in Passaic. He found himself in a city in which the dominant political groups were about to put that right clear out of its misery. He took it by the hand and did his best for it. He spoke for a free press, for free speech, and most particularly and emphatically for free assemblage. He declared himself and went on.

In the meantime certain social groups in Passaic, hitherto quiescent, had stirred in their sleep. They had slept while the right of free assemblage was denied to the Amalgamated Textile Workers. They had not perceived that people who sleep on other people's rights are sleeping on their own. Their own were now in danger. The industrial and political authorities who were striving to gag the Amalgamated Textile Workers had now undertaken to lift an umbrella of ostensible legality over their purpose by enacting a gag-machine covering everybody.

Therefore, certain members of certain fraternal orders—lodges—benefit societies—woke up with a great cry. It seemed to them outrageous that they should be included among the citizens whom the Constitution does not follow. They addressed themselves in ardent inquiry to the members of the City Council.

Similarly the American Federation of Labor in Passaic woke up. The Amalgamated Textile Workers do not belong to the American Federation of Labor. They are out of communion with Mr. Gompers. They dwell by themselves—an independent heretical sect—neither A. F. of L. nor I. W. W.

The local Passaic A. F. of L. unions had looked on without protest while the "permit" system was applied without warrant of law to the Amalgamated Textile Workers. But now, although the new proposed "permit" system was in the strictest form of law, the local Passaic A. F. of L. unions were indignant. Now they looked through the form to the essence. Their deep—very deep—love of the Constitution had been primed. It gushed out.

The Chairman of the Board of Business Agents of the Passaic Trades and Labor Council stood before the City Council and displayed his grievances and his warnings. He said:

"The American Federation of Labor was loyal throughout the war. Today it receives a slap in the face."

He did not say that he hoped that this slap would sting the American Federation of Labor into being for the constitutional rights of Mr. Debs and of Mr. Haywood and of Rose Pastor Stokes as well as for the constitutional rights of those members of the labor movement who agreed with Mr. Gompers about the European war. But he continued: "I tell you, gentlemen, you are treading on dangerous ground. Samuel Gompers, that good old man, has headed the American Federation of Labor for thirty-two years. He has held labor in check, and held it well. . . . . However, the time is coming when he cannot hold it. Labor will show its teeth, and butt."

I call the attention of Mr. Palmer to that last remark. It shows that Lenin is leading the Passaic Trades and Labor Council.

Nevertheless the representative of that Council, standing before the Passaic City Council, went on to a truly American remark. He said, and he hit our whole constitutional situation on its vital spot when he said:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"It is about time that one-man rule was done away with."

Whereupon the City Council at once passed the one-man gag ordinance. At once!

The people who want to continue to have an economic despotism are obliged now to try to quench words. The "destructive" things that they have discovered on the persons of their workers through the researches of their inquirers are words. Espionage has brought back to these people a great haul of words. They have found that the missiles which they cannot answer are words. They know that their economic system—in its existing autocratic phase—cannot survive words. But there is a quick limit—a limit of cost—to imprisoning populations for words. There is a much more deferred limit to preventing populations—by the permit system—from assembling for words. Therefore permits and licenses—pure personal autocracy—by ordinance or without ordinance—in city after city—in defiance of Bills of Rights—is economic despotism's political necessity.

The system of these people is becoming one vast concerted treason. WILLIAM HARD.

The Rebel Switchmen

PROBABLY the strike of the railway switchmen will have run its course before these words reach the reader. An issue, nevertheless, will remain. In these terms the Attorney-General of the United States has defined it: "I think it highly important that not only the country but the men on strike themselves should understand what is behind this strike, what are its purposes and the ultimate goal sought. . . . . In a word, this strike is the latest and largest manifestation of the working out of the program of the Communist internationale of Europe, whose purpose is to capture industry and political power of government, to establish dictatorship of leaders of the proletariat and to bring about the ultimate triumph in this country of the chaotic conditions existing in Russia."

This statement, made at the close of a Cabinet meeting in Washington, was not qualified by any of Mr. Palmer's colleagues. In the public's eyes it must represent the dictum of a united Cabinet. The charge it makes is serious and sensational.

There were thousands of men on strike when Mr. Palmer spoke. There were, in fact, so many thousands, and they had gone on strike so spontaneously, that Mr. Palmer did not attempt to count them all as revolutionists. They had been misled, he said, by their leaders. "It is important that men heretofore in the service of the railroads, good loyal Americans most of them, should understand just what they have been unwittingly led into by certain powers behind the scene." Who, in his judgment, were the powers behind the scene?

Presumably, chief among the guilty, are the thirty rebel leaders arrested in Chicago. It was in Chicago that the strike started. With the approval of the Attorney-General these thirty men first were served with warrantss. If there has been a conspiracy to overthrow the government here is a group of ringleaders.

On the day I write (April 16th), I stood with these thirty men in the office of the federal District Attorney in Chicago. They were not the terrified "foreigners" who usually constitute the results of a Department of Justice raid. Shannon, Malone, O'Toole and Murphy; Cunningham, Logan, Devoy and Dolan—this was the sort of name to which the rebels answered. There was a Schultz, to be sure, and a Radke. But no Romanoffs and no Trotzkys. Names mean next to nothing. But these half dozen fit the men who were served with warrants on the 15th of April. They are, the bulk of them, native-born "Americans" or "Irish-Americans." Most of them are along in middle age. All but a few have families to support, on a wage of 62½ cents an hour. They are not the "agitator" type. Each one of them has a long record of service in an occupation requiring skill and courage.

John Grunau, leader of the strike, was one of the men who stood in the office of the District Attorney. Few people ever heard of Grunau until a week ago. But there are some people in Chicago who remember him. They are the old Progressives. In 1912 Theodore Roosevelt opened campaign headquarters in Chicago. John Grunau had charge of the labor bureau of that headquarters. Later he went to the capital of Illinois, a colleague of Medill McCormick's in the Progressive bloc elected to the State Legislature. Today, by the Attorney-General of the United States, he is branded an enemy of his country. Grunau, in the District Attorney's office, refused to accept the bail that was offered him. Accepting bail, he thought, would weaken his position. On this point most of his colleagues disagreed. They turned in securities to guarantee their reappearance upon order of the court. Mr. Palmer might have been puzzled had he examined those securities, and made inquiries about the way they were acquired. I watched a dozen men come into Room 857. Each one had a packet of bonds to offer as bail—Liberty Bonds, every one of them—$50 and $100 Liberty Bonds—their own savings and the savings of Heaven knows how many other men working on a salary of 62½ cents an hour. The man at a desk, handling

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their securities, looked up from his counting. "These are the Bolsheviki," he said.

Against these thirty men what are Mr. Palmer's specific charges? There is a good deal of general comment in his statement about the effort of the I. W. W. and similar organizations to gain control of the four great Brotherhoods. That counts for little. The I. W. W. has been trying to gain control of organized American labor for twenty years. No doubt it will keep on trying. What counts, so far as Mr. Palmer's point is concerned, is the extent to which the I. W. W. has succeeded in the present instance. What definite evidence does the Attorney-General submit, to support the charge that this switchmen's strike is part of an organized effort to establish a Soviet government? In the version of his statement carried by the Chicago Tribune (April 15th) he describes four things as having definitely happened:

First, the railroad workers were led into the strike "under leadership of the I. W. W. in the United States, acting directly as part of the Communist party of America and affiliated with the full program of the Communist internationale."

Not one of these thirty men with whom I talked (with some of them I could not talk; they had been warned by Mr. Palmer's representative that even talking about the strike was conspiracy against the law) was a member either of the I. W. W. or the Communist party. It seems pertinent evidence on the point: (1) That some of these leaders themselves did not even join the rebel organization (I saw their cards) until after the strike had started; (2) That the strike developed spontaneously in many quarters where no effort had been made by the Chicago leaders to produce it; (3) That when it came to the actual swearing out of warrants (as contrasted with the making of statements in Washington) there was no attempt on the part of Mr. Palmer's representatives to prefer charges of collusion between the strike leaders and the I. W. W. or Communists—the strikers were simply charged with violation of the Sherman and Lever acts. How thin the I. W. W. relationship is may be guessed from the comment of General Leonard Wood (April 16th) that he failed to find "any evidence of connection between the railwaymen's strike and the I. W. W. activities." (Chicago Herald and Examiner, April 17th).

In the second place, Mr. Palmer asserts that the leaders of last summer's steel strike attempted to take a hand in the present affair: "After the collapse of the steel strike William Z. Foster, Carl Person, A. E. Reese and others of his associates of the revolutionary parties engaged in the endeavor to promote the present strike."

Presumably Mr. Palmer's agents have discovered some sort of correspondence upon which he can base this statement. The switchmen's leaders deny that Foster and the others are in any way associated with their strike. I do not see that it matters—unless Mr. Palmer undertakes to prove that Foster, Person and Reese represent Moscow, the I. W. W. and the Communists. There is, however, one other light in which the introduction of these steel strike leaders can be viewed. This is the implication that steel workers and switchmen have been in collusion for the achievement of some revolutionary object. That implication Mr. Palmer's statement may have carried to many readers. The plain facts are these:

1. That these same rebel switchmen refused, last summer, to strike sympathetically with the steel workers in South Chicago.
2. That steel workers, during the present controversy, have actually been at work in the yards of South Chicago, helping to break the switchmen's strike.

A third statement of the Attorney-General's has to do with John Grunau, leader of the rebel switchmen. Grunau he associates with plans for the "one big union."

There is nothing, yet, on the statute books of the federal government to make agitation for a single industrial union of workers a criminal offense. When Mr. Palmer raises that issue he is simply banking on the lack of critical faculty on the part of his readers. Assume, however, that agitation for trade union organization along industrial rather than craft lines is a criminal offense. What then? Does Mr. Palmer know the switchmen are ready to demonstrate that when sympathetic unions of other crafts offered to affiliate with the rebel strikers, John Grunau turned those offers down—declaring that his union was a switchmen's proposition—that and nothing more?

Finally (so far as concerns Mr. Palmer's account of what has actually happened) there is his statement that at a certain crisis in the efforts to promote a single union, "one Bidwell, a member of the newly formed Chicago Enginemen's Association, replaced Grunau."

There is little that needs to be said about Bidwell, except that the strikers were still following Grunau after this statement was made. Bidwell is a man with a family, a resident of Chicago for ten years. The Chicago Tribune (April 15th) quotes him as denying that he is a member of any revolutionary party.

This strike, I think investigation will show, was not made in Moscow, or in the headquarters of the Communist party, or in the offices of the I. W. W.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was made in the White House, in the Capitol, and in the offices of the four great railway Brotherhoods.

Last July, let it be remembered, the railway workers asked Director-General Hines for an increase in wage schedules. They again called his attention to their needs, in October. Mr. Wilson asked that the demands be held in abeyance until the Attorney-General had had a chance to bring down prices.

Prices did not come down. The Chicago Switchmen had been working, in July, for 62½ cents an hour. They were working, two weeks ago, for 62½ cents an hour. Theirs is a hazardous trade. Men in crafts demanding less risk and no greater skill were receiving higher wages. The July demands of the railwaymen had been sidetracked; the ninety days beginning in October had expired. There had been no relief for the railwaymen. But an obliging Congress had passed a measure taking good care of the interests of security holders, and leaving what the workers believe to be a loophole for the use of the injunction which prohibits strikes.

In these issues the Chicago strike had its spontaneous origin. The strikers put forward demands including a wage increase from 62½ cents to $1 an hour. Brotherhood officials assert that the rebel leaders chose to use legitimate grievances of the rank and file for an attack upon the present leadership of the railway unions. They are right about that. It was certainly one of the ambitions of the rebels to establish new organizations independent of old leadership. That, however, is scarcely an aim to be confused with attempted seizure of the political power of the American government. Rebel leaders asserted that the ruling authorities in the Brotherhoods had fallen down in the matter of wages, had (for some time past) been governing their organizations without paying sufficient heed to the great rank and file. The wave of spontaneous strikes that swept the country showed these issues had reality.

Doubtless the rebel leaders promised more than they could deliver. In this sense they misled their followers. In the same sense Mr. Palmer himself has more than once misled his followers. It is a fault common to leadership and responsibility. Doubtless, too, the striking workmen can be accused of bad faith in breaking existing contracts—though their own contention is, that having resigned from the Brotherhoods, and asked recognition for new associations, the old contracts were no longer binding. The rebel leaders can be accused of misleading their followers and of jumping contracts. It can be said that they took the wrong way to go about getting just results. None of these things alters the fundamental factors in this amazing prairie-fire strike. Those factors are an inadequate wage scale, an unfair and hostile railway law, and an indifference of Brotherhood leaders to an insurgent spirit that is no new and sudden development. Alll these things are real grievances. They were not met intelligently. The Brotherhood leaders gave no sign that they were aware of a domestic problem in democratization; Mr. Palmer (with the Cabinet apparently behind him) cried Bolshevism. These answers were categorical, but inadequate. Perhaps every one of the thousands of strikers will be at work again within a week. That will not mean there is no issue left unsettled.

What will remain, I think, is not Mr. Palmer's issue of red revolution—but less sensational questions for the Brotherhoods, for the railway managers who are considering wage scales, and for the Congress that was satisfied with a railway bill that must sooner or later be rewritten.

C. M.

An All-British Sonnet

(Peace Celebration)

HAIG, unto whom all loyal hearts give praise;
And great Lord FRENCH of YPRES—most glorious name;
O that Lord Byron were with us in these days,
(And Lord Tennyson too,) to celebrate thy fame!
RAWLINSON and ALLENBY likewise we acclaim,
And crown Sir ALFRED KEOGH with medical bays;
On Admiral JELLICOE too, and BEATTY the same,
With admiration and respect we gaze.

Last, (but not least), for GEORGE, our splendid King,
(Fifth of his name, and son of *Edward VII*).
And for QUEEN MARY, (his wife)—our prayers we bring
That happiness may be showered on them from Heaven!
May a large family be his, and hers,
Nobly brought up as strict tea-totallers.

SIEGFRIED SASSOON.

A Dynamic Personality

Thoughts rush through your eyes like express-trains,
  Dive into the tunnel,
And shoot out
  With a wild hoot and clatter,
Devouring the landscape.
  I suppose you are very clever
But I know it's a tremendous relief when you've hurled
      yourself
  Out of my valley:
The willows resume the stream,
  A song-sparrow trills,
Winds and water placidly take up
  The thread of their conversation.

CLARA SHANAFELT.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

Hands off Ireland?

SIR: The British government is out to capture American opinion on the subject of Ireland. To this end we have had, in the past few months, Lloyd George's flattering speeches, the visiting Methodist clergymen, the anti-Sinn Fein propaganda that is sent out by the British Consulate, the protests of Britons and clergymen and consuls against de Valera—and now, as the culmination of this effort to mould and direct American opinion, the prepared statement of the new Ambassador, Sir Auckland Geddes, devoted practically exclusively to Ireland.

I confess I dislike the idiom of ambassadors. It did not need the conference at Versailles to make their lingo detestable, it has aways been detestable as a form of expression designed especially to put something over, to conceal its author's real purpose and to convey instead a sense of its author's purity of motive, loftiness of character, sublimity of intention and veneration of idealism in general. There is nothing about Sir Auckland Geddes's statement to make the idiom of ambassadors more acceptable. He trots out the quite hackneyed formulae of nobility and disinterestedness. The inspiration of British policy in his time, he tells us, is to bring order out of chaos, to extend the boundaries of freedom, to improve the lot of the oppressed, to increase the material prosperity of the world. This is very pretty and idyllic but this country is hardened enough to understand even the Boer war. We know that Britain has extended the boundaries of oil territory as well as freedom, that it has inevitably been improving the lot of the oppressors as well as oppressed. We could even tolerate the idea of the material prosperity of Britain as well as of the world. We could even have it said that the Turk is to stay in Constantinople. But above low things like these Sir Auckland beautifully soars. He sings his song entirely to the tune of idealism: "For generations England has given sanctuary to representatives of the discontented and the unhappy, the oppressed and the downtrodden." Sometimes, he omits to say, this sanctuary has been the sanctuary of the internment camp, martial law, hunger strike, massacre, cold military execution—the sanctuary, in short, of the prison and the grave. But facts like these have no currency among old-fashioned diplomats.

In regard to Ireland Sir Auckland Geddes's prose-poetry follows these general lines: "Ireland is afflicted with a centuries-old distemper." It is racked by dissensions and antagonism and disorder and disease. The Rev. Dr. England is standing by, helpful and God-fearing as always, "trying to provide political machinery whereby the antagonized sections of the Irish peoples can work out their own internal political salvation without economic ruin to Irish interests." It almost reduces one to tears: the Irish "peoples" so hard to deal with, Dr. England "refusing to quarrel with Ireland," yet patient with Ireland, unselfish toward it, moving with slowness, moving with caution. "We have learned," brethren, "how difficult it is to right a small wrong, or even a great and bitter wrong, without creating a new, a greater and a still more bitter sense of wrong."

To what, then, does this lead? There is no quarrel whatever, as Sir Auckland Geddes says, between England and Ireland. What exists is simply an unhappy misapprehension on the part of the Irish people. Ireland wants to be free. It is thrown down on its back and England, holding Ireland by the throat, is trying to force down Ireland's gullet a patent weak solution of "home rule"—and this palpable humanity on the part of England Ireland cruelly misunderstands. It does not see that this "solution" is the only possible way in which England can meet Ireland's "legitimate" aspirations. Ireland has no proper conception of its own "legitimate" aspirations. Hence, as is clear to everybody, the military and the police are needed in Ireland to keep Ireland in position until the country accepts those "constitutional responsibilities" to which it has pleased God and England to call it.

Such being the case, and a very clear case, "it will be the duty of all British subjects who are not domiciled in Ireland to stand aside and leave those who live there to solve their problem"—by regurgitation, perhaps, or by that kind of collapse that follows the water-cure: but, at any rate, it is the duty of all to "stand aside." And "I venture to add that it will also be helpful if the many in all parts of the world who are not British subjects, but are interested in Ireland, likewise stand aside and leave the Irish in Ireland to grapple with their own political difficulties." A program, that is to say, of neutrality in thought as well as in deed.

Against this advice and warning, delivered with the idea that England is recognized to have no selfish interest in the matter and is, therefore, the proper arbiter of Ireland's destinies, there has to be set another conception of the part America may play. America has a moral interest in the agonizing struggle of any small nation striving against a more powerful nation. Not, certainly, according to the Prussian ideas of internationalism, but certainly according to the ideas of internationalism that we preached during the war, America cannot excusably "stand aside" while Lloyd George and his government drive Ireland by military force into a dictated "constitution." America's outspoken disapproval of this dictated constitution, or of any constitution not devised by Irishmen for Ireland with a military safeguard for England, is the one thing that Irishmen must seek, and have a right to seek. The Irish recognize just as well as Sir Auckland Geddes that America is the court of last resort. If America does "stand aside," as England begs it to do, it is really taking sides. And Sir Auckland has been sent here to ask the United States to take sides, against the principles of the recent war or any serious application of those principles to England.

"Various Irish writers," Sir Frederick Pollock writes in his recent interpretation of the League of Nations, "including some who deserve serious attention, have raised the question whether the standing problem of Irish autocracy can come before the League of Nations. There is only one way in which this could happen, namely, that the Government of the United States should declare Irish-American sympathy with unsatisfied nationalist claims in Ireland to be capable of disturbing good understanding between Great Britain and the United States. That is a possible event if a solution is not reached within a reasonable time, but it is more likely that a confidential intimation from the United States would not only precede a formal reference to the Council but avoid the necessity for it."

Sir F. Pollock, a pure legalist, sees the perfect propriety of this country's registering its own opinion as to Ireland's unsatisfied claims.

Lloyd George's measure does not satisfy those claims. No one pretends that it does except professional pretenders. Yet the insistence that America "stand aside," solemnly implies to America that England has truly satisfied the national claims of Ireland.

Will Sir Auckland Geddes be successful in his effort? I hope not and I believe not. He has started out in the regular fashion of old-fashioned diplomats. He has taken

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the line that England's rôle in this generation is everywhere the high moral rôle. This has never been true of any country and is not true of England. As regards Ireland it is a perversion too serious not to confuse the moral values of everyone who accepts it. And there never was a time when Americans could less afford to have their international values perverted. FRANCIS HACKETT.

For the Children's Sake

SIR: With the sanction of Mr. Hoover and the cooperation of the Administration he is Chairman of, the American Relief Committee for Hungarian Sufferers (Hotel McAlpin, New York) is collecting funds to help the starving and naked children of Hungary. The Administration fixed one million as the minimum sum required for this winter. The winter is already gone and only $350,000 have been received. Does the public here not realize, then, how great the need is?

Latest reports told us that by March the famine would be complete. They state, that out of 18,000 babies born in Budapest in 1919 above 11,000 died before the year was out. The hospitals have been described as houses of death, where the physician might be replaced by the coroner. Thanks to the help rendered some have now been supplied with sufficient linen to allow of a baby's diaper being changed once in 18 hours: This is described as the maximum of restoration.

Reduced by long war, devastated by revolution, stript to the skin by Rumanian armies and flooded by refugees the country has been unable to recover by any aid yet sent. Listen to the description of things seen with her own eyes by a Red Cross delegate in Budapest in January:

"In all the houses we visited there were no fires; what little wood for fuel the people could steal—and many were there who preferred to die than steal—just sufficed to cook a little supper. With no heat the people huddle together promiscuously, like animals, in order to keep warm; and thus they live in stench and filth without heat, or light or air. Windows cannot be mended, since the glass factories are in parts now cut off from Hungary. The children have nothing on except their sordid shirts; none has more than one. Neither can they be washed, since there is no soap or fuel. In one room six chidren had two pairs of shoes between them, three rags, called dresses and one torn shawl. In the streets one seldom sees a child, because thus naked they cannot go out in the daytime. The three younger of these six take turns to wear the shoes and go to the Hoover Kitchen, each so getting one meal every third day. The older three take turns to go out at midnight and wait in the bakers' queues till morning. Nothing was more appalling than the wasted face of the little ten-year-old girl, who had been out that night. The next room had naught in it save three children in an old dirty sheetless bed, where, though not sick, they, like many others, lay huddled together for the warmth's sake. The third room contained eleven children besides adults: they had four pairs of shoes among them."

And what of the children of the judges, teachers, college professors, for whom their mothers sew dresses out of old curtains, shawls, anything, who also have no shoes, who are wasted and underfed, but whose parents, used to give rather than to receive, do not exhibit their misery, nor appeal to the generosity of the foreigner, but patiently endure, perishing in silence. MARSHALL KELLY.

New York City.

Another Sort of American

SIR: Having read in the current issue of the New Republic the article by Robert Herrick telling us "Why he is not the sort of American who is a friend of General Wood's," I am fired with a longing to reply to it.

In the interest of fair play for which it stands, will the New Republic give me space to state how utterly unfair in its insidious implications Mr. Herrick's article seems to me?—I wonder!

Why should Mr. Herrick saddle General Wood with the odium of the reactionary opinions of his own friends—the "sweet voiced" hostess of the dinner party and her disgruntled ex-patriated brother? Just in passing, one wonders why Mr. Herrick, being so out of sympathy with his host's opinions and dinner and "cellarage," accepted their hospitality, and one can't help feeling a little sorry for the poor hostess. No wonder the conversation "languished," with one of the guests singing a hymn of hate in his heart, and despising the company! But if Mr. Herrick's friends are absurdly cherishing a hope of finding a "military dictator" in General Wood, should he become President, one could almost shed a tear for them, for sore will be their disappointment—General Wood did not win favor in Cuba by wielding a "Big Stick." His claim to the confidence of those who know him does not lie chiefly in his military record, splendid soldier though he is, but in his immense administrative ability and wise statesmanship.

I lived in Cuba during the period Leonard Wood created an orderly government out of chaos. It seemed a miracle then, and it seems so now in retrospect.

He had everything to contend against—demoralization everywhere, a poverty stricken country, jealousies between lately warring peoples, and dislike and distrust of Americans from all factions. In fact the one and only thing the Cubans and Spaniards ever did agree about was their dislike of us.

All the world knows how General Wood did his job in Cuba—it is not necessary to recount the steps by which he established peace and decency and a running government, in a country that had for years been in as desperate a condition as Mexico is now.

His labor ended, General Wood came home, carrying with him the respect, the gratitude and the love of all factions—Spaniards, Cubans and his own countrymen.

Mr. Herrick tells us there is "not a drop of blood in him that is not antagonistic to the militant General"—Well, we must acknowledge the General's "militant" ability too, and some of us, whose husbands and sons went over-seas, are thankful for that far sightedness and military efficiency which secured to them such poor measure of preparedness as they had. Mr. Herrick is not—we grant him—that sort of American. ALMA HODGES.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The Great Untouched

SIR: I would ask a question. Why are the feelings of those who were responsible for present conditions—whether altogether intentionally or otherwise—those who had no loss to fear such as the awful sting of death brings, marked "Handle with care—Don't crush"? They are the "Great Untouched." And we who went down into the valley of the shadow of death, even if we are right (independent of that pitiful fact), are so in the minority, so in need of a leader and a bit of support, that we think it is the time for the second coming of the Savior if anything is to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be accomplished. Can we build a new national conscience such as we promised the boys who fought for it, if we just patch up the old government, if we put the new wine into old bottles, if we are so afraid of the old and existing order of things that we are fearful of disturbing it, although we know it to be wrong? In other words must we advocate new principles of truth so carefully, and slowly, as not in any way to discommode or embarrass those most responsible? No such consideration was extended to the youth of our land, when they were asked to offer their lives. I am no extremist, nor do I expect the world to be made over in a day. But if we have a big job before us, I do think we should commence it. We all acknowledge that something is wrong with world conditions. Why not let the truth prevail? Mrs. M. F. BALDWIN.

Marion, Indiana.

Dog-in-the-Manger

SIR: Your admirable editorial, Our New Merchant Marine, in the issue of March 31st suggests to one not a New Yorker that if that city could be made a little less shortsightedly selfish we could have use for and need the whole blooming fleet the war left us and still build even more ships.

Let us open the Lakes through the St. Lawrence to the sea and make sea ports of Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Duluth, etc., all the great Lake cities.

As it is now, everything for Europe or the coastal trade must go to New York by rail from the Central West. Result: awful, appalling traffic congestion of sea board freight, embargoes, a slowing up of production because every one knows goods can't reach their destination if shipped.

That Great Lakes opening to the sea is the key to many of our problems. We prate of under production. Montana and neighboring states have potentially vast resources that are below the economic horizon and that can only be raised to profit bearing when that territory is brought—via the Great Lakes—a thousand miles nearer the world's markets. So with Idaho and Wyoming. And Colorado could tell us a tale about the efficiency of her outlet to the Gulf being robbed by congestion in the dense traffic area east of the Alleghanies.

When we want to move our wheat east pretty nearly all other traffic has to cease.

We of the Middle West, a third of the country's population and area, producing nearly seven-eighths of its staples and metals, must perforce contract all our output, funnel most of it, for foreign trade, through the small end of railways going into New York just because that city is swinish enough and has had the political pull to keep the rest of the country so bottled-up. Her opposition is the only thing in our way. There are no engineering difficulties in unbottling the Lakes, and the cost is negligible. The water power that can be developed, along with the transportation, will save $500,000,000 in fuel a year, and will make it possible to save our cities from the grime and soot that mar our buildings and clog our lungs.

Opening the Lakes to the sea will give us an ocean highway in place of a thousand miles by rail, a saving of 500 miles in actual distance to Northern Europe; the elimination of two transfers of all our freight that now cost us more than the entire haul.

It will make the states bordering the lakes a part of the sea coast.

It will extend the sea way to the heart of the continent.

It will bring to light hidden resources of the mountains and the plains.

It will increase the industrial power of western centers.

It will open world markets to American enterprise.

It will enhance the profits of established agriculture and industry.

It will double the efficiency of our national transportation system.

It will give the continent the service of the world's merchant fleets.

It will add productivity to millions of idle acres.

It will restore to usefulness a natural water highway.

It will make the Great Lakes an American Mediterranean.

All this has been blocked because New York lusts for the toll, the picking she now makes and has made of all freight to and from Europe by rehandling it from ship to car or vice versa, and the other advantages she reaps from being *the* seaport of the country. She fears Chicago's competition, that the latter might also become a great commercial metropolis. She can brook no competitor in her class, so by all means, fair and foul, she's doing her blamedest to thwart our plans.

Foolish too, for the more we grow the greater she too becomes, her port business would be enhanced not cut down. She'd get greater toll in other ways, but, dog-in-the-manger-like she has her bone now and will take no chances at getting a bigger one or having us rob her of that one.

She used to be humpy about it and tell us to go hang when we suggested opening the Lakes. Now she fawns and whines, talks patriotism, feels sure we would not divert pennies to Montreal or Quebec, that we must be proud to see her the one great seaport, etc., etc., a tone that betokens weakening. Wouldn't it be laughable if in spite of all her efforts we should secure the needed legislation and put our Lakes-St. Lawrence-to-Ocean through and do all these things, and furnish power even to New York for all her mills and factories, and use all the ships we are now somewhat anxious to sell? F. W. FITZPATRICK.

Chicago, Illinois.

Educating Commuters

SIR: As a commuter I have seen my fellow travellers depending for news and even opinion entirely upon the daily press. On Thursday evenings they carry home a five cent illustrated weekly, which they are likely to quote on the following morning. The more studious among them obtain what they call both sides of a question from a digest of the daily press, failing to recognize a similarity of attitude toward social reconstruction upon the part of those papers whose prestige entitles them to frequent quotation.

Fiction, prejudice, and red herrings crowd from the columns of the daily press all but occasional references to the American Labor party, the Nonpartisan League, or the Committee of 48. The conditions which caused and maintain these movements are apparently known only to those who suffer under them or are supporters of the liberal periodical press which you represent. Of the latter I have at times increased the number, but the process is slow. Reading and digesting opinions is not a popular indoor sport.

I am interested in greater publicity for the aims of the American Labor party. My method is crude and direct. I get copies of its platform from Mr. F. J. Esper, 166 West Washington St., Chicago, for seventy-five cents a hundred. While waiting for change in a store I offer

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one to the clerk. The conductor who takes my ticket or my fare gets one. Barber and waiter, coat-room boy and bootblack, each person with whom a payment for service supplies an introduction, receives a copy.

Are these circulars acceptable? They certainly are. A man will glance at the title, "Declaration of Principles of the Labor Party," return a look which says "Comrade" more feelingly than words, and stuff the leaflet into an inside pocket.

With my fellow commuters my method is less direct. The circular is offered as something which gives a good idea of what labor seems to want.

There is, I believe, a large and growing class of white collar workers standing at a social threshold, aware that something is wrong, but by tradition suspicious of labor without a yoke. To its members I give the circular as a program which has a surprisingly large portion applicable to our social group. I ask my friends to check the planks they agree with and those with which they would agree if sure of the interpretation. To ensure the proper interpretation will, of course, require our affiliation and active interest.

The other morning on an early train, full of skilled laborers, my companion in the seat refused the daily paper which I offered him as an introduction. His eyes would not permit reading on the train. But they responded to the large title letters of the circular. His friends in other seats then asked for copies. They were New Englanders without a trace of crimson, some of whom claimed not to have voted for years because they couldn't see the difference between the two large parties.

The harvest seems to be waiting. Are others interested in adopting my method of reaping? J. M.

An Amherst Memorial Fellowship

SIR: A very important and significant gift has recently been made to Amherst College in the form of a memorial fellowship which provides for advanced study in the field of the social sciences. This fellowship arose from a realization of the need for a more complete adjustment between man and existing social, economic and political institutions. Its purpose is to give impetus to the study of the principles underlying these human relationships.

One of the most interesting features of the gift is the fact that applicants for the fellowship are not confined to the list of graduates of Amherst College.

To be eligible for appointment to this fellowship, a candidate should be a college or university graduate—though not of necessity a recent graduate. He should be a man of sound health. During his previous training he should have shown those qualities of leadership which are founded on strength of character. He should have given evidence of marked mental ability in some branch of the social sciences—economics, political science, and history—and have given promise of original contribution to his particular field of study. He should have demonstrated a spirit of service rather than ambition for personal advancement, and should intend to devote his life to the betterment of social conditions through teaching in its broad sense, journalism, politics, or field work.

A fellow shall be appointed every second year for a period of not more than four years, depending upon the qualifications and requirements of the individual candidate. It is earnestly desired that at least half of his appointment shall be spent in study in Europe. The last year, in part or in whole, depending upon the decision of the Committee in charge and the Board of Trustees of the college, shall be given to Amherst College. It is hoped that each fellow shall at some time deliver a course of lectures at Amherst and that these may be published. The Fellowship Fund will provide $2,000 a year for each fellow.

It is desired to have this fellowship meet the demands of existing social and intellectual requirements, and to this end the Committee may modify this original deed of gift every ten years. The donor reserves the right to consult with the Committee regarding suggested modifications. If at any time, in the opinion of the Committee, there is no further need for this fellowship, the fund shall be transferred to the General Endowment Fund of Amherst College. AN AMHERST PROFESSOR.

Preparedness and Profiteering

SIR: The editorial in the New Republic on Universal Military Training and Preparedness was excellent and brought out a point that most people completely overlook. It seems to me, however, and to several other ex-soldiers I've talked to, that you ought to go a step further and provide for the elimination of profiteering as an integral link in your general scheme of preparedness. Our lack of preparation for the past war was shown in three ways—shortage of trained men, shortage of munitions, and profiteering and the rise in prices. You can't conduct a war democratically unless you provide that no one shall make a cent out of it. Of course it is a very large order. But the more it is linked up as an essential part of preparedness the less demand there will be for universal military training, because the munitions profiteers would rather see us go into the next war totally unprepared than prepared to such an extent that we would be prepared against profiteering. P. Q.

That Fellow Foster

SIR: I want to call your attention to the utmost danger all of us are facing, as American citizens, from the present irresponsible and violence-inciting attitude of the United States Attorney-General.

On Thursday morning, April 15th, as I was leaving my room I was greeted by my boarding lady with the following: "That fellow Foster should be hung. I wish I could help do it myself." This was followed with an ignorant tirade against all radicals, etc. After I had succeeded in calming her down I learned that she had just read in the paper that Attorney-General Palmer declared that William Z. Foster, the organizer of the steel strike, was also behind the railroad strike, and that he is leading it in order to break up the American Federation of Labor.

I then explained to my boarding lady that I happen to know Foster and that I knew that for the past few months Foster has been practically secluded from everybody and everything and was giving his entire attention to the book he is writing on the steel strike. I expressed my belief that this was some kind of a plot to get Foster and that I did not believe that Foster had even left Pittsburgh during the past few months. This was, of course, not convincing to my boarding lady.

Fortunately the evening newspapers on the same day carried a front page story with a headline reading as follows: "Foster Passes Short and Ugly Word To A. Mitchell Palmer." It then quoted Foster as calling the Attorney-General a "deliberate falsifier" and giving the same explanation of his recent activities as I have done that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

morning. After reading it my boarding lady, of course, saw that Palmer's story was not to be trusted.

Now I wish to call your attention to the double menace involved in this libellous and irresponsible statement of such a public official. First, had Foster been near a mob of persons such as that of my boarding lady, he, an innocent man, would have perhaps lost his life. Secondly, my boarding lady, a simple minded, and ordinary American woman has now learned that American Cabinet members must not always be trusted. She has been given a lesson which is undermining her faith and confidence in the credibility and integrity of high government officials. This it seems to me is of utmost danger to our American institutions and life. Is not an official who is undermining the confidence of the American people in their government, guilty of sedition and treason to the highest degree, and should not a man of this sort be dishonorably removed from public office?

A. E.

The Anarchist Deportations

SIR: I was on the point of writing you about that article on the Anarchist Deportations in your issue of December 24th, when I read James W. Houston's letter in the issue of February 18th, which took the words out of my mouth. I am writing now because it seems to me that your reply completely fails to answer his question.

Assume, as you do, (and I believe correctly) that an alien can be deported "not for what he has done, not even for what he has publicly advocated, but for his private opinions as extracted in a governmental inquisition," who is to blame? Clearly Congress, and Congress alone. Leaving aside the question of constitutionality, examination of the statute will show, I believe, that its language is so broad that there can be no question that any alien admitting his belief in even philosophic anarchism is subject to deportation. If so, is it fair to imply that the officers of the Bureau of Immigration and the Courts, as in the Lopez case, in so interpreting it have done more than their sworn duty requires them to do?

Mr. Houston asked whether your extracts from the examinations of the immigration officials were fair examples of *all* the evidence in the possession of the authorities. You do not state what "records" were examined by the lawyer who made the extracts, but it seems clear that they were simply the records of the hearing given the alien in every case after arrest in order to comply with the requirements of due process of law. This may be very far from all the evidence in the case.

I happen to know that David Horwath, Kalman Pantek and Joseph Lesko were all interned as alien enemies during the war as potentially dangerous. I do not even assert that this action was a wise precaution, but I *do* know that they were not interned for their private beliefs, but for some public activity designed to influence others, and that their activities were investigated before they were ordered interned. Apart from this evidence which is in the files of the Department of Justice, the military authorities at the internment camps have had an excellent opportunity to observe the prisoners, who have frequently given evidence of their character and inclinations after internment.

Although I have no information on the point, I think you will find that the action taken by the Immigration authorities in the cases of Horwath, Pantek and Lesko was based primarily on the evidence in the files of the Department of Justice, and that these men were ordered deported while still interned. I suspect that the same is true of Torok and Gyori.

Do you still maintain that your account of these cases is fairly representative of *all* the evidence?

F. CUNNINGHAM, JR.

New York City.

[Mr. Cunningham offers a defense of the Department of Justice and of the Bureau of Immigration which is in reality a more serious indictment than any the New Republic has ventured to prefer.

The Constitution of the United States, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, requires that before an alien be deported, he receive at the very least a hearing before an administrative officer, at which he is confronted with the evidence against him, and permitted, with the aid of counsel, to controvert, if he can, the charges upon which he is being held for deportation. This hearing is formal, and the examination of the suspect, and of the witnesses, is taken down by a stenographer, and constitutes the official record of the case. It was upon an examination of this official record that our editorial was based.

Mr. Cunningham now suggests, and he appears to speak with knowledge, that this record did not contain all the evidence against the suspect, but that there is other evidence against the men "in the files of the Department of Justice," and that it was probably upon this secret evidence that the action of the Immigration authorities was "primarily based."

In other words we are asked to believe that the formal hearing, carried through with all the solemnity of a judicial procedure, is a pure sham, a mere mock formality conducted solely "in order to comply with the requirements of due process of law," while the decision is really based upon evidence in a secret dossier of the Department of Justice, with which the suspect is not confronted, and which he is not given an opportunity to refute. We say "evidence," but there is no way of telling that it can even be dignified with such a name. It may be mere hearsay charges, perhaps manufactured by private malice or uncritical hysteria. But even if it seems to the Department of Justice and the Immigration officials authentic and relevant and convincing, the denial to the suspect of any opportunity to deny or refute it strikes at the very heart of American constitutional liberty.

This is not a merely technical denial of due process. Anyone familiar with criminal trials will testify how frequently it happens that the prosecuting attorney will come into court honestly convinced that the prisoner is guilty, only to find that when the charges are brought into the open, the witnesses are cross-examined, and the defendant's evidence heard, the charges prove to be erroneous.

If Mr. Cunningham's information is unfounded, it is high time the Bureau of Immigration issued an unequivocal denial. If it is true, we have a new and startling corroboration of the charges that the officials who have conducted the deportation program modeled their procedure upon precedents borrowed from the Spanish Inquisition, rather than upon the due process of law guaranteed by the Constitution.—The Editors.]

Our Mysterious Naval Policy

SIR: If, as seems to be the case, it be the intention of our government to have a preponderatingly large navy in order to be on hand here and there throughout the world, to impress recalcitrant nations and subtly to exert influence without seeming to do so, why in the name of candor and fair play cannot this policy be enunciated?

San Diego, California. N. E. SLAYMAKER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Things

ALTHOUGH I have spent nearly fifteen years, off and on, in the daily newspaper business, my respect for the claims made by journalism is even now unspoiled and innocent. Many though the chances are that I have had to discover the cynical hollowness of some among those claims, I have availed myself of none of these chances. To this day my reverence for reporters is as massive and as blind as it was on the day when I got my first assignment. What I believed then I still believe, namely, that there is and ought to be no limit to the publicity of private life. If a reporter asks me any question, no matter how inconvenient, how damaging, my impulse is to admit the truth. Let him back up his demand by saying that the public has its rights, and at once I surrender, break down, confess everything, unpack my heart with words, tell him even where I was on the night of October 7th and the early morning of October 8th, 1871.

Thus have I earned, I cannot help thinking, a right to be heard on those few occasions when I feel that this time, alone among many times, the truth ought to have been suppressed or retarded, the public kept in ignorance forever or for a few days. Such an occasion has lately arisen. I refer, of course, to the publication of the news that Robert Underwood Johnson, on his way from Paris to Rome as Ambassador designate of the United States to Italy, had unexpectedly turned up at San Remo, where Mr. Lloyd George, M. Millerand and Signor Nitti were in conference. I refer, equally of course, to the news, published in the New York World, that Mr. Johnson's arrival complicated things; that "the British, French and Italian delegations immediately assumed that Mr. Johnson" was "at least the bearer of important tidings from the White House"; that even after his commendable effort to knock this assumption on the head "interest in Mr. Johnson's presence remained keen, and smiles greeted the announcement that he was not present on the President's behalf in any way." All this, I maintain, should have been withheld from the public—in whose bosom it could only raise hopes illusory and unfounded—until the British, French and Italian delegations, becoming better acquainted with Mr. Johnson, had recovered their poise, had even begun to wonder how his presence, in San Remo or elsewhere, could ever have excited them. The remedy for a man's presence is sometimes his continued presence.

Mr. Johnson's own conduct in this emergency seems to have been, except as to one or two details, all that the fussiest critic could desire. He was quickly aware of "the sensation excited by his sudden and unannounced presence." He was quick not to underestimate the untoward significance of this sensation. He was as quick as was compatible with the natural dignity of his prose style to issue a calming statement. I quote the World's text: "The Ambassador designate of the United States to Italy, on his way to Rome to present his credentials, quite by accident was stranded in San Remo en route by circumstances in which there is no political significance. As he was about to leave Paris via Modane, the train selected was taken off owing to the Italian railway strike. The only alternative was to go via the Riviera, with the understanding that if on arriving at the frontier there was still difficulty in transportation the Italian authorities would facilitate the journey. Reaching Ventimiglia, it was discovered that there was no available train toward Rome. So a delay of twenty-four hours ensued, which the Ambassador and his wife employed in a much needed rest. Mr. Johnson confirmed the statement that he had no relation to the conference, official or non-official, and his stopping here was purely a fortuituous chance. He and Mrs. Johnson are proceeding to Rome to-night by the first train."

The good intentions of this statement are obvious. It is meant to be quieting and soothing. It is a commendable attempt to allay international excitement and unrest. If the crisis which called it forth were not already past no word in criticism of it should appear on this page. But Mr. Johnson will likely be in Italy for a year at least, morbid psychologists are teaching us to look upon the "purely fortuitous chance" as the fulfilment of an unconscious wish, some equally fortuitous chance may once more strand him in a spot at which he is not expected, and upon which all the limelights in the western world are playing. In such a future how would it be wisest for Mr. Johnson to act? Not quite, I think, as he has acted at San Remo. The statement which he will issue, with the best intentions, should cover more ground and kill off more suspicions than his San Remo statement, which I, for one, cannot read without a slight surprise.

Mr. Johnson was in Paris, about to start for Rome by way of Modane and the Mont Cenis, when he learned that "the train selected" had been "taken off owing to the Italian railway strike." The only alternative was to go "via the Riviera." At this point Mr. Johnson ought to have been less concise, for at this point hundreds of thousands of American readers lowered their newspapers, looked across their breakfast tables, and said to their wives: "I don't quite get that. What does he mean 'only alternative'? Why couldn't he have taken the train from Paris to Lucerne, and from Lucerne by the St. Gotthard to Milan and points south? Why couldn't he have gone to Milan by way of Lausanne and the Simplon? By either of these routes he could have steered clear of San Remo. If the Italian railway strike had tied up both these lines why in thunder can't he say so? Funny thing, ain't it, that the only line to Italy that was open happened to land him in San Remo, of all places? And here's another thing. If he had to go by the Riviera why didn't he get off at Nice and go to Genoa by boat? Before the war a boat used to leave Nice for Genoa every Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday at 9 a. m. Longer? Yes, but by boat it's a darned sight pleasanter. More scenery. You don't have to go through all those Riviera tunnels. . . . Sure, the boat stops at San Remo, but not for long, and nobody there would have noticed he was on board her. The strike may have tied up the boat? Well, why don't he say so? Take it from me, Hazel, there's something phony about all this. This man Johnson *wanted* to stop off at San Remo."

Thus the average reader, who is sometimes right. I wonder whether he isn't essentially right this time? I wonder whether Mr. Robert Underwood Johnson, even if all railways and all part-rail-and-part-water-ways to Italy had been open, would have been able not to hear the call of San Remo, that centre of pilgrimage and throng? Does Mr. Johnson not know, in his heart of hearts, that he was chosen to go Ambassador to Italy not so much because of his familiarity with great affairs as because he is a poet whom occasions move to verse? One of these days the world will be reading, unless I miss my guess, "San Remo, 1920, by Robert Underwood Johnson." Memory is the mother of Muses, and how can a poet remember what he wasn't there to see, to feel, and to make scan?

P. L.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literary Notes

IN the Freeman for April 7th Percy H. Boynton of the University of Chicago goes after the scalp of the great Puritan-baiter, H. L. Mencken. On the whole the attack is serious and not too supercilious. For years H. L. Mencken has been teasing the professors and the Puritans, and a much more savage retort could be forgiven. But in his eagerness to score against Mencken and what he calls "the tart set," Mr. Boynton strains a point or two. As against Mencken's acceptance of Whitman he claims Whitman for the Puritans, saying that possibly Mencken "does not care to acknowledge, or perhaps he does not know, that Whitman was the greatest Puritan of them all." He also resorts to the old gibe, "to the tart set anything so remote as 1880 belongs to the dim and misty past." And he says that Mencken does not understand certain books of Mark Twain because he says, "Our great humorists, including even Mark Twain, have had to take protective coloration, whether willingly or unwillingly, from the prevailing ethical foliage, and so one finds them leveling their darts, not at the stupidities of the Puritan majority, but at the evidence of lessening stupidity in the anti-Puritan minority."

Mark Twain's independence of the Puritan majority is felt by Mr. Boynton to be sufficiently represented in Innocents Abroad, The Man that Corrupted Hadleyburg, Joan of Arc, his War Prayer, "his protest at the indignity done to the remains of George Holland, or the controversy with Dr. Ament on the Boxer indemnities." This is a stout array of evidence on the side of Mark Twain's anti-Puritanism, but is there not something else to be said? Can anyone remember that Mark Twain stood by Gorky against what Franklin Giddings called Gorky's "lynching"? H. G. Wells notes in The Future in America how a strange mob-fury swept around Gorky almost immediately after his fine reception. "It was like a summer thunder-storm. At one moment Gorky was in an immense sunshine, a plenipotentiary from oppression to liberty, at the next he was being almost literally pelted through the streets." It was an occasion for anti-cant, if ever there was one. But Mark Twain failed to speak.

Perhaps one reason he failed can be found in a kind of Puritan simplicity that invested his attitude toward women. Or, rather, toward American women. Of French women he had his own opinion, as his squabble with Paul Bourget revealed. But in that same squabble, in which the American's ignorance as to his own grandfather was favorably contrasted by Mark Twain with the Frenchman's ignorance as to his own father, he went on to make grand generalizations about the American woman. What could France teach us? "Government? No; Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, Nobility, Democracy, Adultery—the system is too variegated for our climate. Morals? No, we cannot rob the poor to enrich ourselves. . . . Purity of women may safely be called universal with us," and so on.

But any submission or deference to Puri-tyranny on Mark Twain's part is a small thing to remember by itself. He understood Gorky's cause. "My sympathies are with the Russian revolution," he says in words that Americans might profitably re-read. "It goes without saying. I hope it will succeed, and now that I have talked with you, I take heart to believe it will. Government by falsified promises, by lies, by treacheries, and by the butcher-knife for the aggrandizement of a single family of drones and its idle and vicious kin has been borne quite long enough in Russia, I should think, and it is to be hoped that the roused nation, now rising in its strength, will presently put an end to it and set up the republic in its place. Some of us, even of the white-headed, may live to see the blessed day when the Czars and Grand Dukes will be as scarce there as I trust they are in heaven." Glorious words! And we, black-haired and white-haired, have lived to see that blessed day, and lived to see American soldiers die doing their little best to squelch that same republic.

Mr. Boynton's gibe as to the tart set's not knowing anything before 1880—it has something in it, but surely "the recrudescence of the New York Bohemians of seventy years ago" might suggest to Mr. Boynton that there is still some need in America of the "very aggressive, very unconventional, and very clever." The fact that it *is* a recrudescence is the most damaging fact he notes. And almost equally damaging is the fact that the plea for a national American literature is an old plea, "begun in revolutionary days." The safe and sane, for whom Mr. Boynton speaks, have had much to do with making the tart set as tart as they are. They have forced the young men, as Mr. Boynton admits, "to retrieve the balance of the times." This is the chronic defect of the American academic literary tradition. Our schools began timid, they continued timid and they remain timid. If everything literary that has come from American academic circles was destroyed tomorrow, lock stock and barrel, the fine literature in English would not be noticeably depleted.

What must be done to make the aggressive, the unconventional, the clever, a little more interested in the dim and misty past? Is it enough for professors to use the bait of the present, to be sweet about O. Henry and warm about Rudyard Kipling and generally very eager to show a broad understanding of the world in which their pupils live? It is scarcely enough. In the countries where there is a good rich literary tradition, the thing that seems best to help the literary tradition—and so to open the road to yesterday as well as the road to tomorrow—is a deep sense of the reality of the things that are taught, a sense of their significance, their thickness, their indispensability. But where is the sap of the literary academicians in America? Whom do they honor? Whom do they live with? How much feeling have they? How much energy have they? Why are they so toneless, so hopeless, so crabbed, so dreary, so drab? Youth coming into the presence of these hired mourners of culture cannot help feeling that literature is not a presence, but a corpse. Anything—an anti-prohibition joke, one of Mr. Mencken's wheezes about marriage, one of F. P. A's references to Cyril—anything seems fresh and crisp after the funeral-church atmosphere of the professional class or text-book. The truth is, to American professors good literature is usually literature safely dead and good taste is protective coloration. This Mr. Boynton well knows. He knows that the superior vitality is the vitality of the heretics. It is the depressants in Puritanism that the Menckens revolt against. And the professors could vindicate even Puritanism if they went about it the way Bernard Shaw does—a Puritan who is not whispering his way through life, like a faint professorial wind rustling dead leaves. PICCOLO.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Romantic Woman

The Romantic Woman, by Mary Borden. New York: A. A. Knopf.

AS between Chicago and London, it appears from this novel, there is one grave difference in the leisured-class idea of love. Chicago has not so much distinction as money, London not so much money as distinction. It follows that where the leisured Chicagoan comes to lay her romantic emphasis on distinction, (social distinction pleasantly supposed to imply moral distinction), the leisured Englishman is not quite as occupied with naïve preference. Romantic love is permissible for him, of course, often in the form of illicit love. Marriage is a serious matter so far as the institution of the leisured class is concerned, and has to be combined with a due amount of social and financial calculation. The financial calculation is perhaps primary. Granted the aristocratic English attitude toward marital infidelity, almost any sort of butcher's daughter or baker's daughter can be assimilated to the aristocracy—provided she is an American heiress. But she must be content to take her social elevation as the equivalent to her money, not expecting too much of that rare moral commodity known as love.

It is a situation more or less on this order that Miss Mary Borden (Mrs. Spears) orientates in The Romantic Woman. Her Chicago is called Iroquois, but it is glaringly her own native Chicago, with nothing but the name disguised. And one of the main interests of her interesting novel is the rough way in which she handles her bourgeois Chicago, even alongside her extreme candor concerning the "distinguished" Englishman. The distinguished Englishman, she is perfectly free to say, is almost wholly misleading. What in his case seems to be a deep and thrilling personality is usually a quite competent egoism disguised according to a very remarkable tradition and code. But while this is indisputable, Chicago has the disadvantage of incompetent egoism rampaging without the vestige of a tradition. "Young married people in Iroquois gave me the impression of having risen together in a state of conjugal and amorous irritation from a double bed, and of being about to retire there again as sure as the sun went down and the lights of society went out." So Miss Borden bluntly describes the Chicagoans of good society. Elsewhere she attempts what is scarcely less than a new Chicago Massacre. "Society has to justify its existence constantly, to give evidence of its actuality daily. Without traditions, or titles, or world-old names, without landed estates, or hereditary noses, or state decorations, without any of that stability of a group revolving about and deriving its life from a royal palace, it is obliged to fall back upon clothes for its insignia. . . . No counterpart of an untidy and comfortable dowager duchess with bad table-manners and antique bonnets exists in Iroquois." Miss Borden understands the social predicament of the leisured class in America—all dressed up and nowhere to go, except England. And Chicago not having gone to England, like herself, she punishes it with something like maliciousness. She even defines the Chicago matron's virtue as virtue malgré elle. "Their interest in this poor tragedy was the more voracious because they were virtuous women—and ignorant. They had reached the average of forty without tasting the flavor of illicit emotion. Their marriages had been love-matches. . . . Poor little society women of Iroquois, with your ropes of pearls and your female companionship, you had nothing natural to fall back on but motherhood, and you became mothers with a vengeance—not in the number of children you brought forth, but in the intensity of your mothering—and if your mothering was a silly and greedy and withering thing, who can blame you? You had no other outlet for those animal instincts you concealed so cleverly under your flat stylish bosoms."

Managing to relieve her feelings in this fashion, Miss Borden is also engaged in telling a vivid story that has a double purpose—one, to portray the Chicago heiress eventually married to the ducal Englishman; two, to explicate the soul and character of this "romantic" woman. In both undertakings, but particularly the second, Miss Borden is not a little pretentious. She does not avoid trying to take more soul out than she has really put in. At the same time, she has a rich theme and she knows her theme. She has a real Englishman in hand and she knows him; and she has a vitality almost as good as the vitality of art. Hers is not the detachment of art or the sincerity of artistic self-expression. It is the drive of emotion, the sincerity of a personal confession told in provisional terms. Yet the provision is almost sufficient to carry the narrative into real creation. A little more detachment, and Louise and Phyllis and Jim and Binky would have had a viability of their own.

The material for Binky is certainly precious. The young American girl meets him in India amid "a group of weary, stupid, plucky women, and their soldier men." In this little dusty place near the Afghan frontier, where under well-bred boredom there was so much amorous tension and intrigue, the heiress falls in love at once. "I was full of the poetry and color I had been imbibing, ripe for romance and for adventure—dangerously, deliciously ripe for adventure." Binky's real name "in those days" was (the Honorable?) Captain Gilbert Humphrey Fitzgerald Dawkins. He was in a cavalry regiment, so handsome, and the Chicagoan came opportunely. After their six years together, his mistress, Claire Hobbes, ("a shark made of ivory") saw clearly that his fate—and hers—had arrived. "You see, it was an established fact that Binky should marry some one with money." "Obviously, fate had thrown this jolly little heiress in his way. I am perfectly certain that he thought of me as a jolly little heiress, in spite of my longness and my sombre eyes, and my general effect of mingled languor and fierceness." He comes to propose, utterly unconscious that anything about Mrs. Hobbes or Mrs. Hobbes' child by himself is relevant to the heiress, but really hot and ashamed because he is encumbered with debts of five thousand pounds. Knowing of his mistress, the young girl at first refuses him. Later she succumbs to him. There is a wholesome American in her heart all the time, Jim, but Jim she forgets in her infatuation for the distinguished Englishman and "the delightful cavity under his waistcoat." "Because of the taste of his lips," she physically expresses it, "I took the nobility of his soul on faith."

His soul, in the end, becomes rather an untenable hypothesis. An excellent code he has, but, "poor Binky, it has taken me so long to understand him, and I did him such an injury in thinking him a wickeder and more dashing and more intelligent man than he really is." She changes, yet not in any serious way does she abandon her fashionable norms.

Miss Borden seems to have the illusion, however, that her heroine has other norms. It is true that Joan talks eloquently at times of having missed "the supreme beauty of loyalty, the costly beauty of faithfulness"; and she refers to the sad fact that she accepted Binky when she really had wanted Jim, of the Yale prom, and so "had ruined her life." There is not a word, however, to prove that this man, for whom she had her "supernatural instinct," is anything but a day-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dream, though she luxuriates in the fact that Jim's wife is suspicious of her and that eventually Jim melodramatically kills his wife. "It is only necessary to be loyal and fine and true to oneself—that's all." This is her romantic code. But unfortunately she adds, "To have, in the act of sex, one's mind beautifully involved, and one's imagination illumined, that is the hope of all romantic people. I refuse to admit that it is impossible. For me it was true—until—well, until I found Binky out." It was true, then, without Jim, which disposes of Jim. What "ruined" her life was something else, probably. Women like Joan have a capacity for imagining themselves "ruined" and not being much the worse for it, except when they wistfully remember the Yale prom.

The hollowness of Joan's life does not depend on her being plus Jim or minus Jim. It is a part of the hollowness of the leisured class to which she belongs, and which she only imperfectly brings under suspicion. With all his drug-taking, his gambling, his indifference to his bastard, his stylish dissipation, Binky is a much better case of human adaptation and fitness than this romantic Chicagoan in search of a soul. She is looking for a soul where she shouldn't hope to find one. People who have souls discover love, but people who have love don't necessarily discover souls. This fallacy of Joan's romanticism permeates the book like the odor of a decaying gardenia. Joan has clear perceptions of the poor terms that the leisured class imposes on smart Americans, but never once has she a clear perception of the leisured class itself. So Jim, stuffy Jim, conveys no sense that her "love" meant anything. And nothing induces her to quit Binky once he becomes a duke.

But the ache of misunderstood romanticism does not destroy The Romantic Woman. Its norms are amusingly fashionable ("there were three million people in Iroquois, but [my father] was the only gentleman"). This fact impairs its comedy, but does not injure its candor. And it is for its candor, not for its comedy or its muddled values, that The Romantic Woman lives.

F. H.

Fallen Kings

The Strongest, by Georges Clemenceau. New York: Doubleday Page & Co.

NOW that the fallen kings and princes squat over Europe under the eyes of the people like evicted tenants sitting out in the streets among their furniture we know that we and not they were responsible for making the war. Quite plainly they are decent commonplace folk whose chief fault was the excessively common one of respect for the rulings of society. When society told them to be All-Highests just as it tells other men to do the dirty work of the docks and mines, they obeyed just as the dockers and the miners do. And when society engaged in a vast propaganda of lumps in loyal subjects' throats at the sight of the little prince in his sailor's suit in order to persuade the kings that what the world wanted from them was public fatuity with a domesticated interest and a militarist setting, the unhappy royalties did their best to fulfil this function. And since it is difficult to be at once powerful and fatuous without sooner or later blundering into cruelty, and even more difficult to be royal and domesticated without drifting into dynastic intrigue, and quite impossible to be militarist and not murderous, they inevitably made the war. They did no more than the duty that was nearest. And if we are to be honest we must insist that if the Allies bring the Kaiser from Amerongen it must be in order that the commoners of the world should defile before him and ask his pardon for having led him into temptation by their reverence for kings.

Now if the making of the war suggests that we have no right to ask men to be kings unless we hedge them from sin with the most rigid constitutional restrictions, the making of the peace suggests that we have no right to ask men to be statesmen. The peace is an abominable thing, and yet the worst of the men who made it do not strike one as abominable people. One can bear to think of them as private personalities, and that is something. There are politicians so abominable that for shame of one's humanity one prefers not to do that, but to imagine them impersonal forces like fog or blight; to most of us Sir Edward Carson seems not so much a man as a thought passing through the mind of Absolute Evil. None of the peace-makers are of that detestable quality, and those two whose personalities have been most clearly revealed to us show themselves, if not, like the kings, victims of an unjust and sentimental demand of society, at least the sad exemplars of a deep disharmony of nature. Mr. Wilson with his fine quality and his failure to lay his fineness as a yoke on the shoulders of the situation, raises the problem, which is at the core of politics, of why men with a delicate ethical sense have not the dynamic power of men of a coarser type, while Mr. Lloyd George perfectly states the converse of that problem. It is inevitable that eyes which have seen a new heaven and a new earth should be a little dazzled and not so sharp at the thimble-rigging as eyes that have never seen anything but perorative dawns; and it is not a man's fault that Providence sends him perorations instead of visions, though it is a grievous fault in his audiences if they encourage him to mistake the one for the other.

This translation of Les Plus Forts reveals that M. Clemenceau also is a victim of natural limitations. M. Clemenceau is not a bad man. He was a good Dreyfusard in a bellowing way. He has always provided a fine opposition, a sharp goad in the thick hide of government. But this novel shows that in any position of power he was bound to do mischief. It is a bad book. M. Clemenceau is a septuagenarian and it was published twenty-two years ago, so it is not one of youth's heady revels at the inkpot, but a measure of his maturity. It presents an amazing combination of ferocious energy and extreme artistic incompetence. He has an air of writing with his biceps; but he evokes neither beauty nor terror nor laughter. The book has "lentor inexpressible," to use a phrase which Lafcadio Hearn applied (probably with less reason) to the time spent by the soul in the tomb while waiting for the Judgment Day. It is so dull that its pages seem to be colored gray. The behavior of the characters is gloomily perverse and their conversation impudently priggish. There is a prelude about a love affair between a Marquis of the old aristocracy and the wife of a manufacturer who, like most manufacturers' wives in French fiction, rarely pays her husband any attention beyond an occasional wince. They have a child and for some reason never fully explained but understood to be connected with the Lady's exquisite sensibilities, she is obliged to remain under her husband's roof and deceive him as to the parentage of the child. The Marquis carries it to the font, though surely under the loosest, the most argumentative system of morality it would be plain that a man ought to make up his mind whether he is going to be a child's father or its godfather. M. Clemenceau is aware, it seems, that life is sometimes capable of great beauty, that out of the bitterness of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heart of man there sometimes blossoms a thing, reputed to be exquisite, named love. This is his conception of it. The woman dies and the Marquis is left to live as a guardian angel by his daughter's side, ever ready with a formless moral exhortation like a pious gas-escape. Not unnaturally the daughter develops a militant hostility to virtue, grows into a purse-proud heiress, and goes to Paris, after which it becomes increasingly clear that the peace of Europe has in effect been made by Miss Marie Corelli. The resemblance is extraordinary. There are the same fearless attacks on evils that no one would dream of defending, the same flapping soprano emotions on the part of the virtuous characters, the same curiously explicit materialism on the part of the vicious personelle, the same powerful demonstration that ignorance can be as exuberant as imagination. . . . .

There, indeed, in that fusion of ignorance and exuberance, lies the secret of M. Clemenceau and his statesmanship. Every page of the book betrays that the author knows nothing concerning the souls of men. One is aware, from what history has told us of the rages and gaieties of the dead and from what one has noticed about the people next door, that human nature is capable of nearly everything; but one must make an exception in the case of the recorded motives and reactions of M. Clemenceau's characters. They are as unlike the motives and reactions of real people as tin is unlike flesh. It matters nothing that M. Clemenceau is a man of affairs, that he is neat-handed at the personal arts of politics; a man may possess that knowingness about the affairs of men and yet lack all wisdom about the hearts of men, even as he may have sharp hearing and yet be without an ear for music. That this ignorance co-existed in M. Clemenceau with burning energy led inevitably to a tragic situation. It was certain that his unspecialized energy would never find adequate outlet in the specialized routine of the medical profession, for which he had been trained, and would make him turn to politics. It was certain that the herd would then call upon him to lead, as they always call on men of this type, moved, perhaps, by ancestral memories which remind them that when the perils threatened were floods and wild beasts and tribes with poisoned arrows it was simple and violent leaders who led them to safety. So M. Clemenceau found himself entrusted with political power although his dense ignorance of human motives made him incapable of evolving a political philosophy. Now the fact that the statesman must choose between the Balkans and the Beatitudes, that he must make up his mind whether he will have "firm" government and wars and civil disorders or "weak" government and civilization, seems entirely irrational to people who do not understand human nature, just as an account of a chemical experiment sounds a silly lie to an ignorant person who has seen the chemicals and is sure they are nothing but white powders. It was natural that with leonine gestures of outraged common sense the author of The Strongest should reject the way of gentleness and tolerance; and that he did so is not a proof that he is of no value to society, since he was as ready to reject anything that ran contrary to his reason, and his reason was shrewd enough in everyday affairs. Thus he was driven back on the only alternative method of government, which is the Mosaic Law. The code of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth has much that gives it authority over the disturbed mind. It is approved of by the impulsive fool that lives in every man's breast, it seems sensible, it has the prestige of antiquity; there is a feeling that since it endured so long it must have worked, although the Minor Prophets went to some trouble to tell us just how well it did work. We were not reasonable to expect M. Clemenceau to abandon so well recommended a political philosophy because of the woes of Central Europe, which have a diminished power to move the heart since they are distant and deserved. Although his part in the peace is a crime he is not a criminal, for it is inconceivable that such a nature could have reacted differently to such circumstances.

The question The Strongest raises is whether we have any more right to ask men to be statesmen than we have to ask them to be kings. There are no men great enough to make decisions concerning the fate of peoples, just as there are no men great enough to wear crowns, for imperfection is the mark of the human breed. That treaties are made which turn a sword in the wounds of the world is the error of the idle democracies who did not take the trouble to thresh out the relevant issues by free and intelligent discussion, and give definite instructions to their representatives; who, for example, knew for five years that something would have to be done about Constantinople yet never began to discuss the matter with animation till the Supreme had made its decision. It is not the error of the men whom with fulsome acclamation we sent off to undertake a task that can rightly be undertaken only by the collective wisdom of the people. We force them to do a wrong to us and also, as this volume shows, to themselves. If they had not been forced to express themselves in the Peace Treaty, the fundamental ignorances of this otherwise shrewd and energetic nature would have revealed themselves in this tedious novel and been forgotten as it was forgotten at the end of the publishing season, instead of being eternally commemorated by certain scars on the face of Europe. Of the Big Four, as of the fallen kings, the people should ask pardon for having led them into temptation.

REBECCA WEST.

American Literature

Cambridge History of American Literature, Vol. II. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

THE Cambridge History of American Literature reveals in the second volume the merits and the defects that were apparent in the first. In its general contents it is not a unit, but simply a convenient number of pages, including as it does the last fifteen chapters of "Book" II, and the first seven of "Book" III. The attempt is made, with varying success, to maintain two methods of treatment. One of these is the critical essay on the obviously distinguished individual. The outstanding men so discussed in the second volume are Thoreau, Hawthorne, Longfellow, Whittier, Poe, Webster, Lowell, Whitman, Lanier, writers of the widest variety of type and distinction, but expounded with similar fulness and respect. The other type of chapter is the group or genre treatment, and includes discussions of publicists and orators; writers on American history; early humorists; magazines, annuals and gift-books; newspapers, writers of familiar verse; Northern and Southern poets of the Civil War; dialect writers; and writers of short stories and books for children.

Among the contributors the college professor and the avowed student of American literature share more largely than in the first volume, Columbia University appearing in the foreground for the very natural reason that Professor Trent and his colleagues have done more to encourage a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

scholarly approach to the literature of the United States than has been done at any other—or any other two—universities. In most cases there is an obvious appropriateness in the assignment of chapters on grounds of the contributors' known expertness in the fields selected.

In point of organization, however, the volume betrays the lack of structural firmness that a volume made up of monographs is bound to show. Thus, among the chapters on individuals Thoreau is set forth largely in terms of his surroundings, and with abundant quotation; but Hawthorne mainly in terms of his philosophy, and with only two quotations; Hawthorne's relationship to the thinking of his day is elaborated almost to the ignoring of his artistry, though he was so egregious an artist; and Webster, an adventitious man of the hour, is dealt with less in terms of his hour than in terms of his rhetoric, or artistry. The Longfellow chapter is written in a modesty which hesitates to take him at his trans-Atlantic valuation; but the books for children chapter carries the American banner flamboyant into the English camp. Poe and Whitman are presented circumstantially, and with copious citation of critics and biographers; but Lowell is treated critically, as he might be today by his successors in the Saturday Club, among whom the main facts of his life can be taken for granted. These observations of course only reillustrate the de gustibus non disputandum thesis. The men who lend their efforts to such a joint undertaking are matured in their judgments, established in their methods, and not amenable to editorial direction. The best to be hoped from them is a mosaic rather than a tapestry.

Yet in the assignment of emphasis throughout the work as a whole there seems to be a certain casualness which can have arisen only in the editorial group. Why should Lanier have as much space as Hawthorne, and Webster more than Longfellow? Why should the poets of the Civil War be accorded more than twice the attention conferred on Whitman? Why were Prescott and Motley given the honor of a separate chapter, while Parkman was dismissed with a parenthesis? And why, in a cultural history such as this, should the American theatre be ignored in a volume which continues the chronicles of the pulpit and the press?

In the main it may be said that the chapters on the well known men are judicious and accepted in facts and opinions, and that the survey portions are relatively unfamiliar and consequently far more informative to the general reader. Professor Cairns's chapter on the magazines, gift-books and annuals is substantially what he presented in his thesis of twenty years ago, but it reaches a public who would never catch sight of the dissertation in the ordinary course of events. The same is true of Professor Matthews's chapter on the writers of familiar verse, for only the few are acquainted with his volume of selections of 1904, or the prefatory essay in it. While these are in the nature of legitimate "revivals," the two discussions of the Civil War poets are genuinely fresh; and the section on the short story, by Professor Pattee, and the section on dialect writers, by Professor Alphonso Smith, are admirable brief statements upon themes about which a great deal of scattered and discursive comment has been uttered.

The first half of the dialect chapter is very properly on Joel Chandler Harris and others, and the due subordination of the others has left space enough for a satisfactorily full treatment of the creator of Uncle Remus. It is a happy fact that so modest an author as Harris should have so enthusiastic and so scholarly a champion as Professor Smith. In spite of the author's frequent disclaimers as to scientific accuracy, and his modest amusement as to the seriousness with which he was taken by folk-lorists, his present expositor establishes his title to a three-fold respect: For his new presentation of a vanishing type; for his contribution to the study of negro folk-lore; and for his exact reproduction of Uncle Remus's dialect. The statement as to the four main Negro dialects, and the condensed treatment of the white dialects, with its very proper acknowledgment of Lowell's scrupulous recording of Hosea Biglow's tongue, round out a chapter which is compact with information and good judgment.

The chapter on the short story is another well-conceived survey. It covers the field from Irving on, recognizing the places of the annual and the monthly, accounting for the development of a new technique and the incursion of new influences, and presenting the story as an actual index to American national character. Yet this chapter brings home to one a further defect inherent in the composite history: the danger which each contributor incurs of developing a disproportionate enthusiasm for the subject of his portion, and of falling into a resultant hyperbole of treatment. The viewing of a whole century and a whole type of literature induces a writer to lyric enthusiasm, as the sight of any commanding view is likely to. Certain it is that some of the sweeping generalizations in this chapter represent more fervor than discrimination. It appears, for example, that "modern science swept from men's minds the vague and generalizing, and the disorderly," a millennial circumstance that most critics somehow fail to discover, or to acknowledge when it is pointed out. It appears also, and no less surprisingly, that "the Civil War had liberated men from provincialism,"—a statement that raises the query as to when America reentered thralldom. Other specific assertions that savor more of dogmatism than of thoughtful acumen include the allegation that Henry James "brought to his work not only the best art that America had evolved, but the best of England and France as well"; that he "was the most consummate artist that American literature had produced"; that The Luck of Roaring Camp, by Bret Harte, "must be admitted to be the most influential short story ever written in America"; that no book since The Luck had ever been launched with such impetus as In the Tennessee Mountains; that, in disregard of the former statement about America's liberation from provincialism, "so completely was local color the vogue of the eighties that the novelist . . . was to be reprimanded if he stepped beyond its limits"; and that Richard Harding Davis was "a literary craftsman who mastered every detail of his craft"; each of which assertions is both open to discussion and incapable of being proven with any finality.

From the ripened judgments that have contributed to The Cambridge History one would like to have attained to a consecutive sense of the intellectual history of the American people,—of the difference between American culture and culture in America. In an organic chronicle of American literature one would profit from recurrent treatments of literary models that have exerted their influence in turn on Irving and Bryant and Longfellow and Holmes and the youthful Howells, and that mark the distinction between the works of these men and the products of Lowell's erudition, Poe's exotic tastes, Whitman's contempt for polite literature and respect for the classics, Mark Twain's untaught niceties of style, and the radical allegiances of the later Howells.

One would like again to follow the consciousness of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these literary models into their fruition in the literary judgments of the elect, their deference to foreign critics, their fear of self-praise, their slowness to recognize homely indigenous powers as in Whitman, Mark Twain, and Joaquin Miller. And, side by side with this cultural timidity of the academic tribe, one would like to see traced the highly contrasting popular judgments of uneducated, complacent America. It is time for the periodicals to be recognized not merely in books of gossip or incidental chapters, but in serious treatment as factors in encouraging and circulating literature that would not have been written except for a market. Yet the average historian isolates Poe, editor of six and contributor to forty-six periodicals, or conceals his relationship to the flowing currents of American literature in a bibliographical by-path.

Some day—with other histories—we must have our literary history written in terms of decades rather than in terms of individuals. Now we traverse the sixties, for example, over and over with every man who lived through them. By this other method we shall see them all through the same lens in the Boston offices of Ticknor & Fields, at John Russell's Book Shop in Charleston, or in New York at Putnam's and the House of Harper; we shall encounter them in the offices of the New York Tribune and at Pfaff's Restaurant and at the Saturday Club and the Atlantic Monthly dinners. And out of all this composite of activities we shall gain a sense not merely of the cultural values of each in turn, but we shall come to a feeling for their relationship to American life, their intimate impress upon it, their contribution to its changing points of view, prejudices and ideals.

Furthermore the whole question of nationalism in American literature is subject to fresh, synthetic treatment. More or less was done of late by implication in the brood of little nationalistic anthologies hatched in the winter of 1918-1919 just too late for delivery to the Student Army Training Corps tens of thousands. The careful selection of this material should serve as an example of what the historian might well do in relating our literature to our national growth. Once again, and in a subtler way, the slow passage from American Victorianism to the undefined limbo of today—from Longfellow to Carl Sandburg, Hay's The Breadwinners to Sinclair's The Jungle, from Hazel Kirke to Seven Keys to Baldpate, and from Gillette's Secret Service to Mackaye's George Washington—offers an alluring vista of which, in a series of monographs, one gets only brief and tantalizing glimpses.

The indexing in this second volume is a great improvement over that in the first. The bibliographies are a real contribution to the uneven work hitherto done in the field, those on Whittier, Poe and Whitman, and those on the group chapters being the best now available. Certain deductions are quite clear from the two volumes in hand of the Cambridge History trio: The first is that the three together will overbalance any other three, or for that matter, any other six, volumes on American literature. The second is that, short of Olympian firmness in editorial control, no series of assembled chapters can have the organic unity that belongs to the best history. And the third is that the scrupulousness of detail that belongs to good scholarship cannot be found in a work that is not throughout the work of trained scholars. All of which is another way of saying that the Cambridge History is the best work extant on the whole survey of American literature, a good work of a fallible kind, and humanly capable of improvements at many points.

PERCY H. BOYNTON.

Private Stephen Graham

A Private In The Guards, by Stephen Graham. New York: The Macmillan Co.

MR. GRAHAM is a Christian idealist who accepted the war as an inevitable struggle for liberty and righteousness. By enlisting as a private soldier he put his theory of the possible reconciliation of war with Christianity to the hardest possible test. His book is a record of his effort to preserve both his faith in the war and his Christian idealism. Both articles of his creed are sometimes threatened with submersion. He finally emerges still confident that he fought in a good cause, still convinced that the spirit of the army is in a certain sense a spirit of holy sacrifice, but painfully conscious of the brutal and degrading effects of military life.

Throughout the book Mr. Graham shows himself a courageous realist. There is no dodging of difficulties, no suppression of evidence, no effort to twist the facts in order to suit his own particular theories. Without exaggeration and without concealment the author sets down his experiences, his impressions of the men about him, his recollections of the training camp and the battlefront. There is no stressing of the note of horror, no premeditated ghastliness in the narrative. On the other hand there is no flinching from unpleasant truths, no attempt to invest trench warfare with a spurious halo of glory and sanctity. The author does not attempt to convey the impression that all the atrocities were committed by the Germans. He quotes the following instructions, habitually given to British troops before going into action:

"The second bayonet man kills the wounded. You cannot afford to be encumbered by wounded enemies lying about your feet. Don't be squeamish. The army provides you with a good pair of boots; you know how to use them. . . . . At this point the Germans come out of the machine-gun nest holding up their hands, and the man with the Lewis gun forgets to take his fingers off the trigger."

These and similar barbarities occasionally make one skeptical about the validity of "the good cause," in which Mr. Graham does retain faith to the end. The moral superiority of the British and the other Allies was certainly not evident in their methods of fighting; was it any more evident in the terms of the Peace Treaty?

The author is not altogether free from a taint of prudishness. He wastes what seems to be a disproportionate amount of moral indignation upon the foul language habitually used by drill sergeants. This is doubtless an unpleasant feature of military training; but it seems pitifully trivial in comparison with the supreme crime and tragedy of war itself. The author's prudishness, however, is not associated with pharisaism. He sees the blasphemous incongruity of chaplains with the rank of officers, avoiding many of the hardships which the men are compelled to undergo, preaching not the gospel of Christ, but the will of the General Staff. Speaking of the slight influence of these officer-chaplains upon the men in the ranks, he says:

"They could not preach the Sermon on the Mount because they thought loving your enemies contrary to the spirit of the war. They could not inveigh against lust because the medical officer was of the opinion that nature's needs must be satisfied. They could not attack bad language because it was accepted as manly. They could not attack drunkenness because it was the men's relaxation,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and a good drinker was considered a good fighter. What was there for a poor padre to say to the men?"

In his description of life at the front Mr. Graham is painstaking in his attention to details; at the same time he often conjures up fleeting images of rare and haunting pathos. He took part in the British advance of 1918, but there is little of the hot flush of combat in his writing. He describes the march not as a triumphal sweep to victory, but rather as a ghostly march through a ruined country full of corpses. His mood of profound sadness only passes away after the armistice, when he describes a fête of welcome given to the British in a Belgian town with the lightheartedness of a child.

Mr. Graham's book is rich in anecdotes. Displaying excellent selective faculty he strikes off the personalities of many of his companions in short characteristic incidents. He neither idealizes nor depreciates the men with whom he came in contact; here, as elsewhere, his first concern is to speak the truth. It is this single-hearted zeal for truth, undimmed by any passionate obsession with some preconceived interpretation of the world conflict, that gives Mr. Graham's work dignity and beauty, and assures it an enduring place in the literature of the war.

W. H.C.

The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans, by R. W. Seton-Watson D. Litt. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.

MR. Seton-Watson's title is misleading. It is involved in an inaccurate use of the word "nationality" which is hardly excusable in a writer of the expertness and authority of the author of this book in just this field. Mr. Seton-Watson has himself had much to do with the success of analytical enterprise that distinguished nationality from the political state and from the nation, that identified its components and studied their relations and interaction for what they were in themselves. Accordingly, the title of his book led the reader to assume that the foremost authority on the Balkans in the English-speaking world was offering a narrative and exposition of the interplay of ethnic groupings, languages, religions, traditions and customs, legends, literatures and cultures generally as they were to be observed in the Balkan area, and as they were influenced and altered by the action upon them of economic, social, political, intellectual and military forces. But the reader's assumption is mistaken. Mr. Seton-Watson has written, not concerning the rise of nationality in the Balkans, but concerning the liberation and political and military adventures of the Balkan states. It is true that he was called to the colors before he had time to finish it, and it may be that what he did write was only preliminary to the discussion of the growth of nationality. A prefatory note by the publishers declares, however, that "the substance of it is in final form and nothing is wanting except a preface and the statement of his general conclusions."

What is wanting, nevertheless, is the significant handling of nationality. What is offered is a history of the Balkan imbroglio from its hopeful beginnings through its sordid developments and disastrous culmination, a history written in the conventional mode and preoccupied with the conventional narrative of diplomatic intrigue and military adventure. Beginning with a brief statement on the Byzantine inheritance of the Turks, and their misuse of this inheritance during their ascendency and decline, he touches upon the original confusion of religion with nationality and then proceeds to narrate, in successive chapters, the story of the struggle first for political independence and then for power of the Serbs, the Greeks, the Rumanians and the Bulgarians. In the course of the narrative the constituents of nationality are mentioned and their role suggested, but never analyzed nor traced. Emphasis is laid almost exclusively upon political and diplomatic factors, more particularly upon the bearing of the ambitions and rivalry of Austria and Russia on the behavior of the Balkan governments, upon the influence on these of the European concert and of the Treaty of Berlin. Fully half of the book is devoted to the rise of the Balkan League and its debâcle.

The story it tells is a very pitiful and a very bitter one. It is a story of treachery, rapine, and murder; of conspiracy and deceit to an American unthinkable outside of a motion-picture; of the malicious evocation of religious and racial hatreds; of greed; of political blindness and military stupidity; of the destruction, one after the other, of the promise of peace and progress in the Balkans by the machinations of the great Powers; of a heartless use of peoples for political and dynastic ends. Mr. Seton-Watson writes, of course, as a partisan of the Serbs and Jugo-Slavs, whose champion he has always been. But no Balkan state and no "great" Power can escape from the inexorable implications of the narrative. The story of the Balkan League, particularly, throws a sinister and a hopeless light upon the prospects of the League of Nations, organized by the protagonists of the same political system that destroyed the Balkan League. What Mr. Seton-Watson's narrative convinces one of is not that the Balkans are bad, treacherous and irresponsible as they appear to be; left to themselves they would have done well enough. Mr. Seton-Watson convinces one of the fact that there is no hope for Europe until the peoples of Europe have had a house-cleaning no less complete than that in Russia.

PROTAGORAS.

Little Houses, by George Woden. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.

IN his first novel Mr. Woden has written a quiet book of the every-day lives of unostentatious people at a time of perceptible, but for modernity, gentle change. Little Houses is "a tale of past years" only in unimportant details, and though it occurs in the nineties—here gray rather than yellow—within the covers of the book, the paradox of the drab ego is not one of years. And the book is essentially a true study of that paradox: the intensely interesting nobody who is you and me. In our flashes of lucidity we realize how unimportant and tiresome we are, how significance crowds into moments and vanishes for months; we know that stupidity and fatigue are as mercilessly true as are brilliance and exultation. And Mr. Woden has preserved that truth in his study of the ordinary people of an English town. He has selected and condensed his material with a rare intelligence which has preserved the tiresome and weary hours of living without demonstrating their qualities in his writing.

The first part of the book moves rapidly, with discrimination in the incidents and moods selected and a keen appreciation of a child's quick impressions at times poignant in its truth. The best qualities of the author's realistic flair appear in the almost impressionistic style by which he reveals the child mind in its fresh grasp of sensuous beauty. Mr. Woden is most a realist and most an artist in description, whether it be through the medium of the irrelevant factual perceptions of the character or in his own reproduction of a landscape or mood. He is at his best early in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the development of the story; the transparency of childhood permits him to exercise his sensitive quickness to notice and enjoy the subtlties of light and color and arrangement in nature.

As the development progresses the reader feels that the wrong man has been chosen as hero. Whenever Sam Bloom enters the action holds a half-mysterious interest and the conversation is better. John Allday is too like his name, but the book is a study of ordinary humanity and because the study is well done interest in the truth of the portrayal gradually overcomes the more obvious craving for excitement.

The third part of the novel becomes mawkish and the writing is bilious with an outworn twaddle about "love, manhood, worthy-of-her, cruel disappointments, tears, despondency," etc., which contrasts strangely with the author's natural felicity in sketching humble family living and in piercing the bathos about large families being a blessing to the poor. Near the end the action becomes catastrophic after Hardy, but this artificial concentration can be forgiven because of a return to the study of "nobodies in little houses." The writing achieves a sympathetic quality seldom found in realism. R. V. A. S.

The Three Mulla-Mulgars, by Walter De la Mare. Illustrated by Dorothy P. Lathrop. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

MISS Dorothy Lathrop's illustrations of Mr. De la Mare's story of three royal monkeys tell his story very much better than does the writer himself. For one thing, Miss Lathrop has quite decided what she wants. Further, she knows how to depict such primitive emotions as fear in a thoroughly simple way. Finally , she is not bothered with a complicated nomenclature, which throughout makes Mr. De La Mare's story difficult to read and raises in the mind of the reader the fatal question is it really worth while to give it all this trouble? Miss Lathrop draws and colors on firm, broad lines, as can be seen in her pictures of the shuddersome "Queen of the Mountains" and the ride of the smallest monkey in the moonlight, as weird and as thrilling as that of the Erlkönig. She is adept at characterization by very simple means and the head and tailpieces of some of the chapters are really delightful. Mr. De La Mare has modelled his story partly on the Jungle book, partly on Grimm's fairy tales. His animals are not human as in the Jungle Book, but are half-and-half—a convention which has the merit of conveying a sense of the magical element. He practically invents animals and some of them are distinctly eerie. On the other hand he has the three-brother convention, with the youngest predominant, and their adventures follow a course, normal in the old-fashioned fairy tale, of perils and outwitting by unbelievably simple means. The book has many possibilities—which have been grasped by its illustrator—and it should be much more attractive than is actually the case. M. H.

Contributors

S. ZIMAND is a member of the Bureau of Industrial Research of New York City.

JUDSON C. WELLIVER is a Washington correspondent who writes for both American and European newspapers and magazines.

SIDNEY WEBB is the noted English publicist. He was the principal founder of the London School of Economics and Political Science.

Bertrand Russell

seems to us to mark the close of an epoch in modern thought with these significant words:

"I am one of those who, as a result of the war, have passed over from Liberalism to Socialism—not because I have ceased to admire many of the Liberal ideals, but because I see little scope for them, except after a complete transformation of the economic structure of society."

If you are still desperately a liberal—if you have seen your ideals of liberty nullified by capitalism and war, but have not been willing to "pass over" into the ranks of Socialism,—if you have grave fears of the repudiation of your ideals by a victorious Bolshevik revolution, you must read Bertrand Russell's candid discussion of your intellectual predicament.

Do you believe that the price of revolution is too great to pay for the realization of your ideals?

Read Bertrand Russell on "Democracy and Revolution" in the May number of

The Liberator

The Liberator,
138 West 13th St., New York.

Enclosed find $2.50. Send me the Liberator for one year, beginning with the May number.

Name .....

Address .....

Add 50c for postage outside U. S.

for 50c—*with a year's subscription to*

THE NATION

a copy of the book which has been called the greatest thing since the armistice—

The Economic Consequences of the Peace

By JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES

The book (published by Harcourt, Brace & Howe) sells for $2.50, and The Nation for one year costs $5.00—a total of $7.50. By adding 50c to your remittance for The Nation (only $5.00) you save $2.00.

Send your remittance for $5.50 to

The Nation Dept. B, 20 Vesey Street New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED